Miss Donegan.

APR 19 1930

The New REPUBLIC

Published Weekly

Wednesday April 23, 1930

The Latest "Cancer Cure"

by FRANCIS CARTER WOOD, M.D.

Investment Trusts Gone Wrong!—IV

by JOHN T. FLYNN

Freedom for the Aged

by ABRAHAM EPSTEIN

Stimson's Report on London

EDITORIAL

FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY

FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR

VOL. LXII. NO. 803

Entered as Second Class matter December 6, 1916 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y. under the act of March 3, 1879

"A Monument to One of the World's Greatest Men"

"Illuminating"
"Eloquent"

"Irresistible"
"Priceless"

MAHATMA GANDHI'S IDEAS

Edited by CHARLES F. ANDREWS

"For all of us *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* is a valuable book. It has been written by C. F. Andrews, a devoted follower who has an intelligent knowledge of Western life and therefore knows how to present Gandhi's ideas to a busy Western world, agitated more by motions than ideas... Anyone eager to know just what is being done in the East... will find eloquent passages in these pages."
—HARRY HANSEN, *N. Y. World*

"If anyone could compose an *understanding* disclosure of Gandhi's personality and philosophy of life it would be Andrews. From no other single source can one so nearly *get* that as from this small volume."—*Survey Graphic*

"It is a monument not to one of the world's greatest men only, but to its author, as brave and unselfish a man as there is on this planet. It contains a wealth of information, and is suffused with the writer's sunny idealism. It ranks with Mr. Gandhi's *Autobiography* as the indispensable source of all study of the saint-politician."
—*The New Republic*

"With Gandhi on the bloodless warpath at this moment and his influence arrayed against the power of the British government in India, it is important to know what his ideas are. Here Gandhi is interpreted by his friend of many years."—*Christian Century*

NO one can be familiar with the affairs of the modern world without knowing Mahatma Gandhi and the ideas underlying his current activities in India.

For the first time a full presentation of his program and principles is made available to Western readers in this book, compiled and edited by Gandhi's most intimate friend and adviser. It will give you a unified, clear, complete conception of the man and his remarkable spiritual qualities. The same dependable information is nowhere else available.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S IDEAS

At All Bookstores Now—Second Printing—$3.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY ~ 60 Fifth Avenue ~ NEW YORK

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1930 NUMBER 803

Contents

The Week 255

Editorials

Stimson's Report on London 257
The League Covenant and the Kellogg Pact 259

General Articles

Freedom for the Aged ..... Abraham Epstein 261
The Latest "Cancer Cure" ..... Dr. Francis Carter Wood 264
Liquor Control in Ontario ..... Merrill Denison 265
Investment Trusts Gone Wrong: IV ..... John T. Flynn 267
City Streets (verse) ..... Harold T. Pulsifer 269
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 270
Cosima Wagner's Work ..... Paul Rosenfeld 271
A Communication ..... Oscar Jászi 272

Correspondence 273

Reviews of Books

A Preface to Hart Crane ..... Malcolm Cowley 276
Three Soldiers ..... Allen Tate 277
Personal Problems ..... Geoffrey T. Hellman 278
Pablo Casals ..... Jeffrey Mark 278
The Click Theory ..... J. L. Sweeney 279
Notes on Novels 279

The Week

THE DEPARTMENT of Justice has issued what may be regarded as President Hoover's official defense of the appointment of Judge Parker of North Carolina to the Supreme Court. This defense is a detailed exposition of the Department's belief that in affirming the Red Jacket injunction Judge Parker was merely following the precedent established by the Supreme Court in the Hitchman case, and that he was compelled to follow this precedent by his oath of office. In presenting this argument the Department of Justice is supporting two thoroughly vicious assumptions, adherence to which will more rapidly destroy the prestige of the Supreme Court than any other influence. One is that the sole qualification of a jurist for high judicial office is conformity with precedent. This creates a vicious circle; if only those men are appointed to the Supreme Court who have not enough imagination, practical wisdom or courage to disagree on any point with its majority, great errors in its policies will be self-perpetuating. The other is that law is a self-contained discipline which does not evolve and enlarge from case to case in order to meet new situations and conform with social and economic growth. The Supreme Court, according to this doctrine, expounds meanings inherent in the Constitution, and judges who have sworn to uphold the Constitution must therefore slavishly follow the decisions of the Supreme Court. But application of the principles of law to concrete cases is something quite different from this; it involves weighing conflicting rights and policies in view of the practical results. There are district and circuit judges who almost certainly would have adopted a different line, or at least a different tone, if the Red Jacket case had been before them, in spite of the Hitchman decision. An inflexible and mechanistic judicial tradition is too heavy an incubus for modern civilization to bear.

PRESIDENT HOOVER'S speech before the D. A. R. contained few surprises, though its moderate and pacific character may have sounded oddly in the ears of those super-patriotic, big-navy ladies. He defended the agreement reached at London, in terms similar to those of his previous statement about it; rejoiced that the United States is in less danger of attack than are the European powers; urged the necessity for further machinery by which international quarrels may be settled peaceably; reiterated the refusal of this country to participate in forcible economic or military sanctions; and again argued for adhering to the World Court. The endorsement of the Court surprised some political observers, who thought that Mrs. McCormick's victory in the Illinois Republican primary, in which she opposed America's entry, might have caused Mr. Hoover to have a change of heart, or at least a change of policy.

IT SHOULD have been obvious, however, that the President was too completely committed to the Court to withdraw his support, even if there were any evidence that the Illinois election turned on that issue—which there is not—and even if he were inclined to swing with every shift of public opinion. His words about the desirability of stronger ma-

chinery for peace will be read with grim amusement in Europe, in view of the very faint-hearted support he gave the consultative pact during the London negotiations; and his felicitations to Americans on their happy lot will likewise produce a disagreeable impression, as did Mr. Coolidge's similar utterances. On the whole, however, the speech represented the better aspect of Mr. Hoover's character, and was one of which none of his supporters need feel ashamed.

SOME idea of the financial burdens borne by Great Britain, largely as a result of the War, may be obtained from the fact that under the new Snowden budget any married man with an income of more than $4,000 a year must pay almost a quarter of his income to the government—22½ percent, to be exact. There are, to be sure, certain redeeming considerations. Persons with incomes of this size are not so large a proportion of the population in Great Britain as in the United States; one can maintain customary standards of consumption with less money in that country. The new tax rates, though higher than those of last year, are not so high as those prevailing from the end of the War to 1922. There are no state income taxes, while the central government assumes many expenses which are borne here by local communities. Most important of all, indirect and concealed taxes are much less important than in the United States. We customarily forget the steady drain in our incomes caused by protective duties, of which Great Britain has few. Granted that British governmental expenses are what they are, Mr. Snowden has adopted the honest and efficient way of meeting them: he neither stoops to conceal the situation by juggling the books, nor adds sales taxes and other indirect forms of levy which lie heavily on those who can least afford them; instead he adopts steeply graduated income taxes and death duties. The fact that he receives almost universal support for this policy from all parties speaks volumes for the political integrity and economic sophistication of the British nation.

THE New Republic is a good enough feminist not to rejoice in the overwhelming victory of Ruth Hanna McCormick in the Illinois senatorial primaries simply because she is a woman. A woman has as good a right to be Senator as a man—and no better. We prefer to regard Mrs. McCormick as an extraordinarily forceful, adept and hard-boiled politician. Her victory is not a victory for anything particularly praiseworthy. Her alliances with machine politicians were no better than those of her opponent, and her main plank—opposition to the adhesion of the United States to the World Court on the basis of the Root formula—is one which seems to us mischievous and senseless. Her campaign against it, based so largely on unreasoning hostility to the League of Nations because of the supposed control of the League by the British Empire, is worthy of the political chicanery of her ally, Big Bill Thompson. Doubtless, Mrs. McCormick is a sincere and convinced opponent of the Court, but if so, she could have contributed something to the morale of politics by more discussion of the real problems involved. This issue will probably not play much part in the election, since her Democratic opponent, former Senator James Hamilton Lewis, does not favor the Court. Here the chief division between the candidates is prohibition, and in this we do not sympathize with Mrs. McCormick's rigid and unreasoning attitude as a Dry. Though she is far more interesting than either the man she has defeated or her next antagonist, Mrs. McCormick has yet revealed few reasons why those who do not judge political questions on sentimental grounds should wish for her success.

THE conference for the codification of international law, which has been in session at The Hague, has ended in a most disappointing manner. While there were several subjects on the agenda, it was possible to obtain agreement as to only one of these, nationality. Even this convention was not signed by the United States, though it is possible that our government (the only one to stand out) may accept it later. The refusal of the American delegates, headed by David Hunter Miller, to endorse the work of the conference was apparently due to the presence of an active group of propagandists from the United States, representing the National Woman's Party, who protested against the convention as drawn, on the ground that in regard to citizenship, women ought to have equal treatment with men. That they do not get it now, everyone is aware. In certain countries a woman takes the nationality of her husband, in others she doesn't; sometimes she loses her own without gaining his. Another set of complications ensues when the marriage is ended because of death or divorce. Americans will agree that women ought to stand on an equal footing with men; but many of the countries represented at The Hague are very backward in this regard, and such a convention as the National Woman's Party asks would not receive general acceptance, perhaps for another generation. The question is whether half a loaf is now better than nothing; and it is a question which should certainly be pondered carefully before it is answered in the negative.

A STRUGGLE is in progress in Washington over the use to be made of the Great Falls gorge on the Potomac River. It is possible to harness the Potomac to create a large amount of hydroelectric power. It is also possible to preserve the river and its banks as a beauty spot for all times to come. The latter purpose is expressed in the Capper-Cramton bill, which has passed the House and is now awaiting action by the Senate, providing that $21,000,000 shall be expended to construct a

national parkway on both sides of the Potomac from Mt. Vernon to Great Falls, Md. The New Republic hopes that this bill will be passed and signed by President Hoover. There is plenty of electric power available from other sources, but the banks of the Potomac are a potential playground of priceless value for the people of the whole region. This has been recognized by the American Institute of Architects and the American Society of Landscape Architects, both of which have endorsed the Capper-Cramton bill. The Institute of Architects says convincingly in a recent statement that "there is no reason why a government as rich as ours should have to barter away to private interests any such natural rights or beauty spots as the gorge of the Potomac, simply for a financial consideration."

JOE, Mike, Tony, Nick the Greek, Wild Bill and all the other bootleggers, wholesale or retail, great and small, have changed their ultimate source of supply. Industrial alcohol, like smuggled whiskey, has ceased to be an important factor in their business. "The diversion and cleaning of denatured alcohol," says a report adopted by the American Chemical Society after careful researches by a committee of its members, "has become increasingly difficult and expensive, and the amount so diverted is an unimportant part of the supply of bootleg liquor, nearly all of which comes from cheaper sources more easily worked." Chief of these new sources is corn sugar. "The production of inedible corn sugar," the report continues, "has grown from a few million pounds used prior to 1921 to 978,000,000 pounds in 1929." From this product, alcohol can be quickly and cheaply distilled. The significance of its growing use is obvious. No longer can enforcement officers concentrate their attention on the Canadian borders and on the distillers of industrial alcohol. Their problem has become vastly more complicated. Without relaxing their watch on these old danger points, they must search at the same time for stills all over the country, but especially in the Corn Belt—where last year, says the same report, they seized "3,430 large column stills capable of making 188 to 192-proof alcohol on a tremendous scale" from corn sugar, and where they failed to seize nobody knows how many others.

LITTLE jobs are sometimes no easier than big jobs, as Alfred E. Smith must have realized when he consented to be the public's representative on the board of governors of the New York Theater League. As Governor of New York, he could always rely on the Republican majority in the legislature to make more mistakes than the Democrats, and thus to maintain his popularity, by contrast. As one of the seven governors of the New York Theater League, he must combat the ticket speculators—far wilier opponents than any Republican legislators. His work will be judged by the results of the struggle, even though his responsibility is divided with his six colleagues. If the new curb on speculation proves effective; if tickets for the most popular musical comedy of next season can be bought at licensed ticket agencies for an advance of 75 cents over the box-office price, Governor Smith of the Theater League will be called a success. If the present situation remains unchanged, ex-Governor Smith will not only be called a failure; he will be called by any unprintable name that enters the heads of faithful theater-goers—who this year are placing such high hopes in his fulfilment of this new task.

THE wild claims so often made by advertisers of foods, some of which have been discussed at length in the pages of The New Republic, are at last to be subjected to at least a limited degree of control. The American Medical Association has undertaken to test food products, and to put the seal of its approval on those which are both meritorious in themselves and are advertised without misrepresentation. Those which fail to pass the test will be the subject of an adverse report (to be published, presumably, in The Journal of the A. M. A.), and these may not be advertised in the pages of The Journal, or in Hygeia, the journal published by the association for the lay public. A manufacturer whose products, or advertising, or both, fail to meet the test, is given an opportunity to reform before the adverse report is made public. While the new project of the A. M. A. is a commendable enterprise, it is obvious that very much more is needed to affect the situation as a whole. The doctors' approval may help an accepted product, but it will not do much to harm a rejected one. This may still be advertised in newspapers and magazines, and the average reader will never even notice the significant absence of the A. M. A. endorsement. If President Hoover were really the state socialist some of his enemies are beginning to accuse him of being, he would see to it that the government itself investigated every food product, and prosecuted advertisers who put forth false and misleading statements.

Stimson's Report on London

SECRETARY STIMSON as head of the American delegation at London has assessed the achievements of the naval conference for the benefit of the American public in exceedingly cheerful terms. Its gains as he sees them are of two kinds: first, economy due to reduction of armaments; second, improvement of international relations due to the cessation of competitive building. His remarks apply only to the understanding among the United States, Great Britain and Japan. It is this that we shall here discuss, leaving some of the broader questions and the position of France and Italy for future comment.

Whether the agreement actually means reduction, and if so how much reduction, depends on the figures compared. Mr. Stimson invokes two standards of comparison: one is the lowest proposed limitation which was considered at Geneva in 1927; the other consists of the ships now built, building and appropriated for—in other words, the naval programs of the several powers as they stood before the conference was called. With each of these standards he compares the aggregate tonnage of the fleets as they will exist in 1936, under the pending treaty.

The first comparison indicates that the three 1936 navies will be 345,000 tons smaller than they would have been if the British minimum at Geneva had been agreed to. In view of the fact that this minimum was not agreed to largely because it would have involved a great increase in the other two navies concerned, the result can be called reduction only by a long stretch of the imagination. About all this comparison means is that the London conferees were successful in getting the limitation to a lower point than that proposed by the conferees at Geneva.

By the other test, it is shown that in 1936 the three navies will be smaller by 560,000 tons than they would have been if the existing programs of new building and replacement had been carried out. This comes much nearer than the first test to being a true measure of the economies arising from the limitation. If, for instance, the treaty is not ratified, the three powers will almost certainly have in six years over half a million more tonnage of fighting vessels than if the treaty is ratified. Indeed, intensified competition might enlarge the existing programs. This is certainly a powerful argument for the limitation achieved, in lieu of anything better. But it is a proof of actual reduction, of course, only if one agrees to accept the basis of comparison.

A much stricter test of reduction, which Mr. Stimson does not apply, would compare the navies in 1936 under the limitation treaty with the navies as they actually are—excluding building programs. Without full knowledge of the detailed figures, it is clear now, as it was during the progress of the conference, that, under the agreement, Great Britain is the only nation which will actually effect a net reduction of existing naval tonnage. The United States has agreed to scrap 69,000 tons of battleships, but we shall have to build more tons of cruisers than that, if we exercise our right to parity with Great Britain. Japan will scrap 26,000 tons of battleships. Most, if not all, of the so-called reductions in other classes mean merely foregoing a certain amount of planned replacement or new construction. We shall in 1936 have the largest and most powerful navy in our history; building and maintaining it will require a far larger amount of money than the navy has cost us in the past six years.

It is beside the point to quibble about these different meanings of the word "reduction." We are faced, not with a lesson in definition, but with a situation which demands understanding and decision. How did the situation arise? The United States has proceeded on two basic assumptions: first, that it was essential to stop the naval competition of the three major sea powers; second, that we must have parity with Great Britain's navy. The first assumption was thoroughly sound. The second is meaningless in reality, but it satisfies a vague feeling of national prestige and cramps the style of the big-navy crowd. It is capable, as this conference has proved, of being roughly formulated in a way that makes possible an agreement between the powers. We now have limitation, and we have the right to parity. We cannot logically protest that at the same time we do not have real reduction. Great Britain's cruiser tonnage could not conceivably be brought down far enough, at least now, so that we could have parity without building more cruisers. Our delegation has achieved the utmost success in this direction which could possibly be achieved on the basis of the assumptions of our naval policy and under the conditions which exist.

In one respect our delegation has not lived up to the promise of President Hoover that we would reduce as far as others were willing to go, naval strength being relative. We have not consented to go as far in scrapping battleships as others were willing to go, or to take steps for their eventual abolition. The reason for this reluctance is stated to be that we ought not to do so until we have brought our cruiser strength up to Great Britain's. This amounts to saying that we should be left with inadequate defense against Great Britain's navy, from now until 1936, if we should agree to abolish battleships. It is a nonsensical position unless we apply wholly strategic considerations, disregard the anti-war treaties, and seriously envisage the possibility of war with England in the next five years. This breach of faith on the part of our delegation would deserve far more serious castigation than it does, if its practical consequences were more serious than they are. Since we have agreed to build no more battleships before 1936, the added expense which it entails is merely a matter of maintenance. And there is a strong likelihood that at that time or before, battleship abolition can be arranged.

The real achievement of the conference is, of course, the stopping of the naval rivalry of Great Britain, the United States and Japan as regards all classes of fighting vessels. The right to build has been restricted by international agreement. Limits may be raised or lowered, consequent upon the action of other powers than these three, but there can be no longer any danger of competitive bidding for supremacy of the seas. That is a gain worth paying a large price for. There will, of course, be drum-beaters thriving on international suspicion and naval construction who will attack the treaty be-

cause they think it goes too far. Their point of view is not worth a moment's serious consideration and should be fought without quarter. The New Republic has much more sympathy with those who will oppose the treaty because it does not go far enough. But we are unable to see how the cause of disarmament could in any way be promoted by failing to ratify it. The only way to stop American building is to cease to seek parity with Great Britain. This is true, whether we have the treaty or not. The treaty gives us the right to parity, but it does not compel us to exercise the right. Excessive American building is much more likely without the treaty than with it, because the treaty does at least fix limits and still the voices of fear and suspicion. On the basis of this precedent, better achievements may be possible in the future. This seems to us a case where, certainly, the good is not the enemy of the best, but its friend.

The League Covenant and the Kellogg Pact

FOR SOME time it has been evident that there was an inconsistency between the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg Pact, in regard to the institution of war. The Pact seeks to abolish armed combat *in toto*. The League Covenant, on the contrary, permits war under certain specified conditions, after every other resource has been tried and has failed; and it may, therefore, be said to legalize the resort to arms even while seeking to make it as infrequent as possible. The League powers are now giving much attention to this inconsistency and are seeking to overcome it. It is a grave question, however, whether their efforts are proceeding in the right direction.

At the September Assembly at Geneva, a resolution was passed declaring that it was desirable to amend the Covenant so that it would no longer accord to members of the League a right to have recourse to war under circumstances in which such a thing would not be permitted in the Pact. The Council thereupon appointed a committee of eleven jurists to draft amendments to the Covenant to this effect, and on March 5 this committee published its report.

Under the Covenant, it will be recalled, the parties to a dispute are not obliged to accept a recommendation of the League Council, even though it is unanimous. If one party accepts the recommendation, the other party merely promises not to go to war; if both parties reject the recommendation, they regain complete liberty of action. Moreover, if the Council—exclusive of the disputants—cannot arrive at a unanimous recommendation, the latter are free to go to war after three months. This limited right to go to war is called the "gap" in the Covenant. The problem before the Committee of Eleven was how to close this gap. It was a comparatively easy matter to draft an amendment to the effect that under no circumstances should League members resort to war; but the question was raised as to whether it was not necessary at the same time to establish a method for the definite settlement of the dispute involved. The Committee of Eleven answered this question somewhat haltingly. It recommended that in case the Council arrived at a unanimous recommendation except for the parties, its recommendation should be binding; but in case the Council disagreed, it should merely "examine the procedure best suited to meet the case and recommend it to the parties."

Some members of the committee believed that in case of disagreement, and after every other means of settlement had been exhausted, the Council should be empowered to refer the case for final settlement to an arbitral tribunal in accordance with the General Act of Arbitration, drawn up at the 1928 Assembly. The Act provides for the specific settlement of all disputes. Legal controversies are to be referred to the World Court; non-legal controversies, in the first instance, to local conciliation commissions. If the parties do not effect an agreement as a result of conciliation, the dispute shall be referred to an arbitral tribunal consisting of five members. Each party chooses one member from its respective nationals; the two other arbitrators and the chairman are chosen by common agreement or by a neutral umpire. This tribunal is empowered to settle the dispute according to principles of "justice and of common sense."

The General Act of Arbitration is the most ambitious effort so far made for the pacific settlement of disputes. Yet for this very reason, few states are willing to accept its provisions. By the end of 1929, only three Scandinavian countries had adhered. In its report, the Committee frankly declared, "in the present circumstances, it does not seem that the members of the League are prepared to submit all their disputes without any exception to compulsory arbitration." Consequently it made no proposal for the definite settlement of disputes over which the Council is divided. It merely suggested that the Council, among other things, should urge the states to seek arbitration, or that the Council, either at the request of one of the parties or on its own initiative, should ask the World Court for an advisory opinion on the points of law involved. "Such application shall not require a unanimous vote by the Council."

Finally, the Committee of Eleven found itself confronted with the question of sanctions. Under Article 16 of the Covenant, League members promise to apply economic or military sanctions against a state which goes to war in violation of the Covenant. If the gap in the Covenant is closed, as the jurists propose, the opportunity for violating the Covenant, and hence the possibility that sanctions will be imposed, is increased. The Committee declares, "Whatever be the nature of the conflict con-

sidered, the whole authority of the League of Nations would be impaired if a recommendation unanimously voted by the Council should remain a dead letter. Various forms of dilatory maneuvering would, moreover, be encouraged. If the Council's unanimous recommendation could again be disputed, states would have an interest in delaying, and in waiting in the hope that a change in the composition of the Council might produce a solution with which they would be better satisfied. In order to confirm the principle of the permanent character of the organs of the League of Nations, it is indispensable that a decision which has been declared to be final should not be capable of being further questioned, and this implies that the decision must be executed."

Thus the concrete result of the anti-war pact, if the report of the Committee of Eleven is adopted, is to strengthen the judicial powers of the Council and to increase the likelihood that League members may be asked to impose sanctions. Both these results are sure to arouse criticism. The General Act of Arbitration, already mentioned, and a number of bilateral treaties, show that the trend recently has been to divest the Council, which is essentially a political body, of its judicial powers, and to vest the settlement of non-legal disputes in the hands of local conciliation boards and arbitral tribunals. It is argued that the Committee of Eleven, in recommending an extension of the Council's powers, goes against this trend. In reply it is pointed out that the Committee recommends that the report of the Council should be binding only in case of unanimity (except for the parties) and that when the Council is unanimous—there are fourteen members—its recommendation is bound to be just. It is probable that in case of serious disputes the Council will disagree; and it is then empowered only to seek out a form of settlement acceptable to both parties, while at the same time keeping the peace. Such was the method used by the Council for a number of years in the Vilna dispute between Poland and Lithuania. It could not find a means of settling this dispute acceptable to both states, but its pressure was strong enough to prevent Lithuania from declaring war.

Some critics feel that it is unjust to prevent a state from resorting to self-help without providing some means for weighing its grievances and correcting recognized evils. The anti-war pact ignored this problem entirely. The Committee of Eleven pays some attention to it; but while it believes in strengthening the principle of sanctions—which may be invoked against any state attempting forcibly to overturn the *status quo*—it holds back from recommending the establishment of machinery for the pacific and equitable settlement of every type of controversy. When it declares that states are not yet ready for compulsory arbitration of all disputes, it is faithfully reporting an existing state of affairs. Some states, and notably those which were victors in the last war, feel that the arbitration of questions arising out of the peace treaties would mean the disruption of the 1919 settlement. Other nations —among them the United States—oppose compulsory arbitration on the ground that there is no recognized international law that can be applied to the most serious international disputes; consequently the judges on an arbitral tribunal are likely to be controlled, so it is said, more by consideration of policy and national self-interest than by a desire to administer an even-handed justice. While there may be some foundation for these fears concerning the arbitration of non-legal disputes, they can be greatly exaggerated. When nations are in the proper mood, they can usually devise a formula whereby the most difficult question may be arbitrated.

The most serious difficulty is one which exists in the realms of *realpolitik* but is ignored by the legal experts of the League. It is that the application of sanctions, under whatever circumstances, is dependent upon the coöperation of the two great sea powers, the United States and Great Britain. The United States will not at present accept any obligation whatever in regard to sanctions. It reserves the right to full liberty of action, which means that it might veto the application of sanctions by the League at any time it saw fit. Great Britain, moreover, will not attempt to apply sanctions if the United States is opposed to such action, and is highly reluctant to do so even when relations with America are not involved. It is the French who are the supporters of the sanctions system, and they stand alone among the Great Powers in their determined advocacy of such a plan today. Under such circumstances, it is painfully unreal for the League to embark upon any enterprise involving the application of force, in the effort to bring the Covenant and the Pact into harmony. Such an effort, if successful, would drive the United States and Great Britain still farther away. The Pact needs implementation in the form of machinery for consultation in case of a crisis. But such machinery should not be created without the coöperation, from the beginning, of the United States, which holds the key to this whole question.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY
R. M. LOVETT GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON
STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

Freedom for the Aged

A Survey of Old Age Pension Systems at Home and Abroad

WHILE European countries are grappling with the establishment of permanent and complete economic security for their wage-earners," said Mrs. Florence Kelley at a recent legislative hearing in New York state, "we ourselves are just awakening to the problems of old-age security." Hers is an eloquent statement of our backward situation. We may have surpassed other nations in our industrialization, but our wage-earners, when confronted with the hazards of modern economic life, remain the most insecure of all industrial workers.

Among the older European countries, the need for mitigating the devastating effects of *laissez faire* through social protection of the working masses became an established principle many decades ago. It was, for these countries, the only means of self-preservation. Shortly after the European workman was liberated by the French Revolution from his feudal masters, he found himself the slave of another system—that of the industrial revolution, with its dogma of unshackled competition. The dangers inherent in the doctrine of "each man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" soon became apparent. And, as the vigor and welfare of the state were beginning to be threatened by the new industrialism, European governments became conscious that their own existence depended on their extending some measure of protection to the economically weaker members of society. The loss of the daily wage or daily bread, through unemployment, sickness, accident, old age and death, was a problem for which a social solution had to be found. Otherwise, the very life of the workers, now rapidly growing in number and importance to the state, was likely to be destroyed by these new industrial risks.

Unemployment and illness are by far the most serious and outstanding of the modern economic hazards. Old-age pensions, however, appeal more directly to the emotions of the public; and perhaps this explains why they were almost the first of the social-insurance measures to be adopted in the industrial countries of Europe. They were preceded only by accident compensation, and they were followed, after an interval, by insurance against sickness and unemployment.

The Bismarckian social-insurance law of 1889, in Germany, was the first of its kind. Today every European nation, with the exception of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Switzerland, has established some comprehensive plan of social action against economic dependence in old age. The plans are of two general types, contributory and non-contributory. Germany has the oldest of the contributory old-age insurance systems. Denmark, by a law passed in 1891, became the first nation to establish a straight system of pensions for its aged.

In Germany, contributions are based upon the wages earned. These contributions range from about 6 cents weekly for the lowest wage class to about 33 cents for the highest, and are divided equally between the employers and the employees. The state, for its part, contributes a flat sum to each pension. The amount of the pension depends both on the wage class of the insured and on the number of years he has been insured. A separate fund exists for salaried employees, who pay somewhat higher contributions and receive larger pensions. Miners also operate under a separate pension fund. The German plan now covers about 20,000,000 persons, and more than 4,000,000 persons are receiving benefits under the law in the form of old-age, invalidity and survivors' pensions.

The English Old Age Pension Act, as originally adopted in 1908, provided for a straight grant of 5 shillings weekly to men and women who had reached the age of seventy and could qualify on the basis of citizenship, residence, income and character. The amount of this pension was gradually increased to 10 shillings weekly. Finally, in 1925, the act was further amended so as to put the system on a contributory basis. Weekly pensions of 10 shillings were continued to all those who had passed the age limit at which the Widows', Orphans' and Old Age Contributory Pensions Act of 1925 went into operation. However, all wage-earners sixteen years of age and over—except non-manual workers whose earnings are more than about $1,000 a year—are obliged to make weekly contributions under the new insurance act. The premiums, which now amount to about 16 cents weekly for a man and 8 cents for a woman, are shared equally between the employees and the employers. Contributors to this insurance fund receive pensions at the age of sixty-five, regardless of their income.

Of the total British industrial population of approximately 18,000,000, all but about 1,500,000 are now insured under this law. On March 31, 1929, it was providing benefits for 742,648 aged persons, of whom 455,271 were between the ages of sixty-five and seventy. The earlier non-contribu-

tory pension acts were, at the same time, providing weekly pensions for more than 1,000,000 additional persons.

Such are the measures adopted in Germany and Great Britain. In France, the Old Age Insurance Law of 1910 was similar to the German plan, except that contributions did not vary with the wages of the insured. They were fixed at 9 francs yearly for men, 6 francs for women, and 4.50 francs for those below eighteen years of age. Employers were to duplicate the amount contributed by the insured. For a number of reasons too complicated to explain, this law did not prove successful. Finally, after a series of parliamentary debates that extended through seven years, a comprehensive system of social insurance was enacted in March, 1928.

The new system, which became effective on February 5 of this year, insures not only against old age, but also against sickness, invalidity, death, unemployment, and provides family allowances for all wage-earners and salaried workers of both sexes whose wages do not exceed $720 a year. Funds for this purpose are to come from the employers, the employees and from the state. One-tenth of the salary or wages up to 15,000 francs, divided equally between the employers and the employees, is the premium set for this comprehensive system of social insurance. The pensionable age is sixty. The amount of the pension will depend on the contributions, and is based on a pension equal to 40 percent of the average earnings of the worker. It is estimated that about 13,000,000 persons, or one-third of the population of France, will be benefited by the new social-insurance act.

The plan of social insurance recently adopted in Russia follows the general principles underlying the other European contributory-insurance plans. It is distinguished by the fact that the contributions are levied entirely upon the employers of labor, whether these be private individuals, coöperatives or the state itself. This provision, however, is not entirely new, since Spain and the Netherlands also raise their contributions exclusively from these sources. The Soviet insurance plans are still in their formulative period, and are constantly undergoing considerable changes. In general, it is the aim of the Soviet government to make its social-insurance system the most comprehensive plan of social security in existence.

The other European nations follow either along the lines of the German insurance plan or the early English plan of straight pensions. To Americans, the Swedish plan, because of its greater universality and simplicity, is perhaps of most practical interest. Instead of direct regular weekly contributions, a special old-age pension tax is collected in Sweden by the regular tax-collecting agencies. This tax is obligatory upon all persons between the ages of seventeen and sixty-seven. Only about 7 percent of the population between these ages is exempted from it. The tax levy is based upon the assessed annual income, and ranges from about 80 cents a year for the lowest incomes to approximately $9 for the highest incomes. The money collected is kept in a separate national pension fund. Out of this fund, old-age pensions are paid at the age of sixty-seven and invalidity pensions at any age. The amount of the pension depends on the assessments. It has been found that administrative expenditures amount to only about 3 percent of the entire cost.

Among the nations of the North American continent, Canada alone has made a comprehensive effort to provide for the security of the aged. By a federal law enacted in 1927, it has provided for pensions of $20 a month, to be paid to needy persons on reaching the age of seventy. The cost of these pensions is to be divided equally between the Dominion government and the individual provinces, which must accept the law before it becomes operative within their boundaries. At the present writing, all the Canadian provinces west of Ontario have adopted this plan, and it is expected that the maritime provinces will shortly follow their example. About 20,000 needy persons are now receiving these benefits in Canada.

And what of old-age security in our own country? Our needs in this respect are probably even more acute than those of other nations. Our aged population is increasing rapidly, both absolutely and relatively. Independent businesses and professions are disappearing in the United States at a faster rate. Family life in America has suffered the greatest disintegration. Our employment deadline against older workers is more widely spread than in any other country, and poverty is more difficult to bear in a country with a relatively high standard of living than in those which know little of our comforts and luxuries. We may have a smaller percentage of dependent aged than other industrial nations, but for those who do become dependent, there is little consolation in statistical averages.

It is often asserted that industrial pension plans will fully provide for our dependent aged in the future. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Because of the heavy costs involved, only a few of the larger corporations can afford to establish a pension plan that is actuarially sound and financially guaranteed. Not even one-fourth of the four hundred industrial pension plans now in operation can be said to meet these qualifications. And even if they could all be made absolutely secure, they would provide for only a negligible percentage of our aged poor. Industrial corporations establishing private pension plans are forced to require from twenty to forty years of continuous service with the corporation for eligibility, whereas less than 10 percent of our workers stay with one corporation this length of time. It goes without saying that such plans can never offer help to the thousands of destitute old men and women who were never connected with industry, such as housewives, domestic servants, writers and journalists, small shopkeepers, peddlers, etc. And even gigan-

tic corporations have not been known to have a lease for eternal existence.

Indeed, with the exception of our higher military staff, war pensioners and federal civil servants, there is no guarantee of freedom from destitution in old age for any of our social groups. Of the nearly 5,000,000 World War veterans who were forced to take out government insurance, less than 30,000 converted their insurance policies to mature at the age of sixty-two. In our blundering and criminally negligent way, we have permitted more than 4,000,000 of the original policies to lapse. Only a few of our states have established adequate retirement systems for their officials, other than judges. Not even a dozen municipalities have made sound provisions for their aged employees. The numerous policemen's and firemen's pension funds are, for the most part, either unsound or totally inadequate for the future needs of their beneficiaries. As for teachers in the public schools of the country, approximately half of them are not covered by any pension provisions whatsoever. An authority on the subject recently asserted that "of nearly one hundred teachers' retirement systems now in operation in the United States, only a few can escape total collapse unless fundamentally altered."

Such is the situation among civil servants of all classes. What can we say of the opportunities for old-age security among the trades and professions? It is true that a number of the churches are now attempting to make adequate provision for their ministers, but even here there is a vast amount of progress to be made. There are few fraternal societies granting old-age allowances. As for the national and international trade unions, only eight of a total of more than a hundred are attempting to care for their aged members, and the majority of the plans so far established are neither sound nor adequate. Although there are nearly 3,000,000 trade-union members, only about 10,000 are receiving old-age benefits. We are forced to conclude that the existing means of providing financial freedom for the aged have proved totally inadequate in the United States, and that progress can be made only by the extension of state and national old-age pension laws.

As regards such legislative protection for the aged, the United States remains the most laggard of all nations. Only at the present time, and largely because of its active championship by Governor Roosevelt and Lieutenant-Governor Lehman of New York, has the movement for old-age security become a national force. And, although the subject has been officially studied, investigated, analyzed, reinvestigated and discussed in the United States for over twenty years, we are still in the study-making stage. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania each had four commissions to consider the subject without arriving at any tangible result; and the president of a leading insurance company urged the New York state commission at its recent hearing to continue to "study" the subject.

It is true that ten states—Montana, Nevada, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Maryland, Colorado, Minnesota, Wyoming, Utah and California—in addition to the territory of Alaska, have placed old-age pension laws on their statute books, but it is also true that pensions are actually being paid in only four of these states and in the one territory. In five states these laws are practically a dead letter, since their adoption was left optional with the individual counties and since no state support was provided. Even in the three states of Montana, Wisconsin and Utah, which are the honorable exceptions, not all counties have adopted the old-age pension plan, and altogether there are less than 2,000 persons receiving pensions under the present laws. However, much may be expected from the California law in effect since January 1.

Six of the eleven states having old-age pension laws provide a seventy-year age qualification. Maryland, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming fix the minimum age at sixty-five years. In Alaska, it is sixty-five for men and sixty for women. A maximum pension of $1 a day is allowed in six states —California, Colorado, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada and Wisconsin. Wyoming fixes the maximum at $30 a month, Montana and Utah at $25 a month, and Alaska at $25 a month for men and $45 a month for women. Kentucky fixes the maximum on a yearly basis of $250. The cost of these pensions falls chiefly upon the individual counties, although in Alaska it is wholly assumed by the territorial government. In California, the state and the counties share the cost equally. In Wisconsin, the state refunds one-third of the cost to the county. In the other states, the counties are expected to bear the whole of the cost, and they often refuse to assume this burden. And so, even in the few states which have adopted old-age pension laws, much remains to be done before the aged are freed from destitution.

And yet, in America today, there is at least a definite awakening toward our neglect of the aged poor. The movement for old-age security has become a public issue throughout the nation. In 1929, about fifty bills were introduced in twenty-eight legislatures and in Congress. In four states these bills were enacted into laws. The activities of the New York Commission on Old Age Security have been followed all over the country, and the bill submitted by it to the legislature has just been passed by both Houses. Governor Roosevelt signed it on April 10. This bill, while not altogether satisfactory, unquestionably signifies the most important move toward old-age security that has been made in America up to the present time. And so the struggle progresses from one state to another. "A good New York state law in 1930," said one authority, "will insure old-age pension legislation throughout the United States by 1940."

ABRAHAM EPSTEIN.

The Latest "Cancer Cure"

The Significance of the Coffey-Humber Treatment

THE GREAT trek to California of the forty-niners is being repeated eighty years later. They went in covered wagons, their descendants go in motor cars and airplanes. The forty-niners went for gold; the twenty-niners are searching for a cancer cure. Will they find it? They will not.

The story is quite a simple one. Two physicians in San Francisco have been investigating the action of the extract of various glands on cancer, and have found that an extract of the outer portion of the adrenal gland of the sheep, when injected into human beings with cancer, causes in a certain proportion of patients a slight degree of improvement. They make no further claims. It is a treatment, not a cure. But California is a land of optimism. From it one must expect bigger and better cures. The climate is more wonderful there than elsewhere in the universe. There is a certain atom of truth in the old story of the gentleman from California who insisted on adding to the minister's funeral discourse a few words about the climate of Los Angeles.

Drs. Coffey and Humber modestly hoped that their ideas might develop into something useful, and expressed that hope before a medical society. An enthusiastic newspaper reporter, believing in bigger and better cancer cures, immediately filled the Western press with optimistic statements which have led many people to the belief that the millennium is now at hand, and that the injection of some of this extract of the sheep's adrenal will do what has hitherto been considered impossible—will cure cancer with a medicine. But the reports from the front are discouraging. Despite the injections, patients are dying of cancer in San Francisco and Los Angeles just as they are elsewhere. It is quite evident that in a few months the excitement will be over.

The cautious scientist asks, since we all have adrenals which give off a chemical substance to the blood, why should cancer ever develop if this substance has a curative effect? It is also strange that cancer should grow in the adrenal, the site of this healing agent. Unfortunately cancer does grow there, in human beings, and mouse and rat cancer can also be grafted into the adrenal of mice and rats and will grow as well there as elsewhere. The grafting of adrenal substance into mice and rats has not cured their tumors.

The announcement of certain French scientists that a serum made by grafting adrenals into a rabbit and then injecting the serum of that rabbit into mice has resulted in a cure of mouse cancer, cannot, unfortunately, be confirmed in this country. Perhaps the French mice cured their own cancers and misled the scientists, for these grafted cancers are only cultures of cancer cells, using the mouse as a culture tube, and occasionally, when a mouse differs in his nature from the mouse from which the original tumor was derived, the grafted animal cures himself, by the same means, in all probability, that bacterial infections are cured—by the production of antibodies. It is well known that a person who has once had typhoid, measles, chicken-pox or small-pox is very unlikely again to have the disease, the body having made a substance which neutralizes the poisons of the invading organisms, giving what we call immunity. In this way a mouse or rat can cure himself of a grafted cancer, thereafter being immune to further grafts.

The slight improvements which Drs. Coffey and Humber have observed in their work have also been seen on many other occasions by using a great variety of products. Years ago Dr. Eugene Hodenpyl, an expert pathologist of New York City, injected the serum of a cancer patient into other cancer patients, and a quite marked improvement was noted temporarily. Sooner or later, however, the inevitable progress of the tumor was noticed, and all the patients died. Other attempts have been made to immunize people by grinding up cancer tissue, first destroying its cells by freezing or by X-ray or radium, and then injecting this ground-up tissue into the body of a cancer patient—an imitation of the methods which are used in the production of immunity to bacterial disease. All of these attempts have failed. The reason for this failure is that the human being suffering from cancer has a disease in which the growing tumor is composed of cells from his own body, and hence these cells are perfectly adapted to the situation and are quite equivalent in many ways to the structures from which they arise. To destroy that tumor by serum or gland extract means that one runs the risk of destroying the healthy cells in the body. This is just what is observed.

It has occasionally been possible, by the administration of highly poisonous substances, to cure a certain number of cancers, though the patient must be severely poisoned to produce the result. If he does not die from the poison, the tumor in rare instances may disappear. But it is only tumors which are peculiarly sensitive which can be thus treated, and the dangers of the method are so great that its application is extremely limited. Thus, the cure of

cancer by a serum is a difficult problem, and whether it can be solved or not, no one can now honestly tell. The brave attempt of Gye and Barnard some years since to establish an ultramicroscopic parasite as the cause of cancer, failed. Investigators have always hoped that such a germ causation might be established, as it would enable them to attack the problem with the experience which has been gained from the production of antitoxins against bacteria. But as this attack was most scientifically and carefully made, hope for the demonstration of a bacterial cause has been abandoned by most of the students of cancer.

The attack must be renewed from every possible standpoint. The important thing is to learn more about the life of the cell, the normal first, then the abnormal. Experimental methods of approaching this subject are being rapidly developed. The method of tissue culture devised by Carrel and others has enabled us to grow cancer cells in solution and study their activities. Much has been learned by the transplantation of tumors in small animals. But this will have to be supplemented by the studies of the zoölogists on the simpler free-swimming cells, like the eggs of sea urchins, and by the studies of the biological chemists. These researches have afforded little help up to the present, but unquestionably in the future they will be the important method of attack. Some constant and characteristic differences between the cancer cell and the healthy cell must be discovered before the direct attack on the production of destructive agencies which will spare the normal and kill the abnormal can be expected.

No doubt the future will see many failures and many disappointments. It is wiser not to try remedies on human beings, but first to use the facilities of the research laboratories to test any hypothetical remedy on animal tumors. If a serum or a chemical will not cure animal cancer, it will not cure human cancer. The difficulties of the problem are enormous, but those very difficulties should encourage the workers in every field to renewed struggle on a problem which hitherto has absolutely baffled everyone who has attacked it.

FRANCIS CARTER WOOD, M.D.

Liquor Control in Ontario

Why the Former Premier Is Not an Impartial Witness

THE OTHER day the Hon. Ernest C. Drury, former premier of the province of Ontario, in Canada, appeared as a witness before the House Judiciary Committee in Washington and told of the workings of the liquor-control system in the province. Many Americans, dissatisfied with the state of affairs at home, and accustomed to look to Canada as a country which has solved the question in an ideal fashion, rubbed their eyes when Mr. Drury announced that the Ontario system is a failure. They wondered, perhaps, whether he was a reliable witness on this subject; and if they did so, it was with good reason. There are some important facts, both about Mr. Drury and about conditions in Ontario, against which his testimony ought to be set. It is the purpose of this article to relate those facts.

Not the least significant thing about Mr. Drury's testimony is the utter apathy with which Ontario itself took his observations. There has been some slight editorial comment, some of which endorsed Mr. Drury's views, but the majority of which deplored his journey to Washington to give a personal opinion of the results of the Ontario experiment which was so at variance with the opinion expressed by a majority of the electorate at the polls last autumn. Generally, there was regret that the House Committee should have heard the testimony of a notoriously prejudiced single witness rather than accepting that of the province as a whole; but these regrets had no violent expression and both Mr. Drury's departure and return were viewed with indifference.

To appraise the worth of his testimony as to the failure of government control in Ontario, it is perhaps well to know that Mr. Drury is an agrarian, a Methodist and a total abstainer, that he teaches a Sunday school class each Sunday, that he has never used tobacco in any form, and that he suffered an overwhelming defeat by the government whose liquor-control policy he bitterly criticizes. An able speaker, a brilliant manhandler of statistics, he has for years been fighting an obstinate rear-guard action in defense of the lost crusade which made of him during a single term in office the Cincinnatus of Ontario. His premiership was a result of the troublesome post-war reconstruction days, when, after the elections of 1919, the farmer's party found itself in power and without a leader. Thanks to his histrionic ability, the choice fell on Mr. Drury.

His tenure of office was neither happy nor successful. A skilled debater, he made a poor leader, and, although a practical farmer, he failed as a chief executive. During his premiership the agrarian party lost supporters, unfortunate scandals concerning the misuse of public funds by one of his Cabinet developed, and in 1923 Mr. Drury was decisively defeated by the Conservative party led by the present premier, who has been twice reëlected,

first as the sponsor of government control and then as its defender. Since his defeat, Mr. Drury has emerged from retirement on his farm at Crown Hill, some ninety miles from Toronto, to engage in oratorical brawls with his former supporters, to contest unsuccessfully a seat in the Dominion election of 1926, and, more recently, to take the stump as the most implacable non-professional prohibitionist in Ontario. His success as a prohibition propagandist has been no more distinguished than his success as premier or candidate.

The Ontario electorate is one of the very few on the continent which have had, since the War, two chances to vote on the liquor question. After ten years' experience of the Ontario Temperance Act it emphatically condemned prohibition in 1927 and elected the party favoring government control. After three and a half years' experience of the Liquor Control Act, it voted even more emphatically for the continuance of government control. In 1929, when the opposition party of which Mr. Drury is a supporter, for want of better ammunition made government control again the principal issue in the campaign, Premier Ferguson was returned with the largest majority ever given a leader in Ontario. His majority, 92 to 20, was something more than an enthusiastic expression of public approval of both his policies and his conduct of public affairs. It was as clearly a rebuke to the Liberal party for having attempted to resurrect as a live political issue a dead social issue killed by the electorate but three years before. The rebuke was directed more pointedly at Mr. Drury than at any other man who took part in the prohibition campaign. Because of the leading part he played and the fervor with which he played it, the unequivocal nature of the defeat suffered by the cause he fought for could have been interpreted as a public invitation to Mr. Drury to make his retirement on the farm permanent. The least discerning of his fellow prohibitionists have interpreted the last election to mean that Ontario has settled the liquor question to its own satisfaction, that it is weary of discussing it, and that it wants to hear no more about it for many years to come.

The statistics he produced at Washington, although they have some basis in fact, created an impression which was a gross misrepresentation of conditions in Ontario. Those dealing with arrests for drunkenness under prohibition and under government control were particularly misleading. Not only is legal "drunkenness" the most shifty of human standards, but law enforcement under prohibition was much less stringent than under government control. With the two principal factors on which the statistics were based subject to undeterminable variations, it can be seen that a comparison of arrests in 1918 and in 1928 can mean nothing. The fact that the number of drunken drivers arrested in Canada has been increasing since 1920 may mean that traffic regulations are more rigorously enforced, that more drivers are getting drunk, or simply that there are more drivers to get drunk. The Liquor Control Act can be enforced, while the Ontario Temperance Act which it replaced was impossible of enforcement. Mr. Drury's government, together with those which preceded and succeeded it, tried sincerely enough and failed. Where today minor infractions of the law lead to arrests which swell the totals produced in Washington by Mr. Drury, four years ago bootlegging was a major industry which made millionaires. Today bootlegging is confined to petty operators—one-drink vendors, after-hours bottle providers, flask toters and, in the remoter backwoods communities, kitchen-stove still operators. Four years ago speakeasies were common throughout the province, with forty-five within twenty minutes' walk of the provincial Parliament buildings; case lots were delivered with impunity by truck to the purchaser's door: today, the writer, with the contacts of a working newspaper correspondent, does not know of a single speakeasy nor the telephone number of a single bootlegger.

Graver objections must be taken to those opinions expressed by Mr. Drury which rested on personal observation and for which no statistics can be procured. One such opinion was given in the statement that under government control drinking had increased tremendously among boys and girls of sixteen years and over. If government control has accomplished nothing else, it has certainly altered entirely that deplorable attitude which youngsters had, during prohibition, toward drinking as smart because it was illegal. In Ontario, the pocket flask has vanished as a common social appurtenance, and clandestine drinking is a thing of the past. Government control has brought about the reëstablishment of the old social taboos against intoxication, which had completely disintegrated during prohibition days. Classes which drank to excess and seemed to regard inebriation as a social obligation now drink temperately. Liquor, for ten years an obsession with great numbers of people, is no longer anything but an incident. For years the principal topic in any discussion, it is now accepted and ignored.

As for Mr. Drury's contention that not government control but government sale alone exists in Ontario, again the facts and the opinion of the majority seem more dependable than his personal opinion. If the sale and consumption of liquor are not controlled under the Ontario permit system, then the term "government control" has no meaning whatever. The system permits a rapid check to be made at any time on the amount of liquor purchased by any permit holder. Not only is every purchase of liquor noted in the permit, but a separate requisition must be made out for every different kind of liquor purchased. These requisitions, before being filled, are scrutinized by a censor who may report the permit holder to the Liquor Commission if he sees fit. Permits are canceled frequently, purchases restricted and consumption cut down when in the opinion of the board it is wise to

do so. Although twelve bottles of hard liquor or wine and one half-barrel of beer may be purchased in one day, and larger quantities are supplied on appeal to the Commission, a succession of maximum purchases is soon discovered and halted.

While few people in Ontario pretend that the Liquor Control Act is without imperfections, the general opinion is that it is a vast improvement on the prohibition experiment it replaced. The testimony Mr. Drury gave at Washington had already been refuted five months earlier by the voters of Ontario. If the committee in Washington chooses to place a greater faith in his opinion than did the people of the province who were conversant with the conditions he viewed with such disapproval, then the committee, Ontario feels, is more to be pitied than censured. A feeling, incidentally, which is generally reflected throughout Canada toward American liquor difficulties!

Toronto. MERRILL DENISON.

Investment Trusts Gone Wrong

IV: *Corporations Own Corporations*

In the preceding articles of this series, Mr. Flynn has revealed the existence of grave abuses in the management and capital structure of American investment trusts. He has shown that many of these trusts are controlled by their promoters, who have invested little of their own money—in some cases none at all. Investment bankers have often utilized these trusts as a means of unloading their securities on the public. This practice contributed to the tremendous losses suffered by many investment trusts in the recent stock-market crash. An exorbitant cost has often been paid by such trusts for a type of management which, judged purely by results, would be dear at any price. Now, in this fourth article, Mr. Flynn discusses the investment trust as a social problem, and shows the necessity for some effective form of social control.—THE EDITORS.

THERE is certainly nothing new in the exploitation of the investor by bankers and promoters. Money has a way of forming itself into pools. Once the only important money pools were insurance companies and banks. The very limited capital demands of corporations were met mostly by bond issues; and these could legally be bought by insurance companies. Hence, the bankers of the last generation struggled to gain contron of the insurance companies. J. P. Morgan, Sr., paid $3,000,000 for the $51,000-par-value stock of the Equitable Life Insurance Society. He could never earn on this investment more than one-eighth of one percent. But he was not interested in the investment: he was interested in that giant pool of money, the $500,000,000 assets of the Equitable. Today, however, the demands of corporations are so vast, and the laws limiting banks and insurance companies so drastic, that other sources of funds must be found. The only sources, of course, are the wallets of the people; but the sums in these wallets are individually too minute and too widely scattered to be effectually managed. Hence, they must be invited into pools where they can be controlled in the mass. This explains why investment bankers are turning their attention to the investment trusts and to investment companies of all sorts.

The final object, of course, is to control industry. The only large user of funds is industry. And so, by controlling industry and also the sources of money, the banker is in possession of both sides of the market. Our bankers have proved themselves thoroughly adequate to this new situation. They have learned first how to draw the funds of the people into the necessary reservoirs or series of connecting reservoirs; but they have also learned how to control industry with smaller sums of money.

At the basis of all this—and the most important social result of it—is the change which is taking place in the ownership of our whole industrial machine. To point out again that now all ownership is corporate is to indicate nothing new. What is not so well understood, however, is the ownership of these corporations. An immense publicity has been given in recent years to the fact that the stocks of our large industrial corporations have passed into the hands of millions, tens of millions, of stockholders. As a matter of fact, this phenomenon has been very much overstated. The process of distributing corporation stocks had indeed set in. If it had not been interrupted it would beyond doubt have gone forward until eventually their distribution would have been nation-wide. But as so often happens, we begin to notice these movements only after their force is spent and they are in the process of being superseded by other forces. The force which is rising now is a very different one—a force which is bringing about, not a wider distribution of stocks, but a tremendous concentration of them. The selling of shares to the public at large, of course, still goes on. But it is moving under an impetus which is presently to cease. We are now to witness the passing of the individual stockholder just at the moment when we are celebrating his emergence. We are to witness now the rise of the corporate stockholder. All this stock which has been so laboriously distributed among millions of small investors will now be re-collected from them

and gathered into the hands of a relatively few large corporate stockholders—corporations whose sole business will be to own stocks. Instead of 20,000,000 individual stockholders, the corporations which operate our factories, our railroads, our utilities, our stores, will belong to a few thousand, perhaps a few hundred, giant investment companies. And among these, I believe, the investment trust will hold the place of first importance.

I must not be understood as advocating or defending this. The concentration of ownership is not my plan. It is not the plan of anybody. It is the result of drift, as usual, along the lines of least resistence and in obedience to the necessities of the system under which we live.

So many factors are pushing us in this direction. First of all, we have the merger movement. Mergers and consolidations are rapidly reducing the number of corporations which control our leading industries. In the iron and steel industry, for example, some 217 corporations hold the great bulk of the business. And these 217 corporations are in turn actually consolidated into 25 great corporate units. Since I compiled these figures, two new mergers have recently been projected, which will still further reduce the controlling companies to 20. In the chemical industry the instruments of production are in the hands of 189 large companies, which are in turn controlled by 17 of their number. In fact, the great bulk of this industry—100 companies out of 189 and $1,700,000,000 of stock out of $1,900,000,000—is centered in seven companies.

I give here a list of a group of important industries and some facts designed to illustrate the amazing extent of this concentration movement. I give the name of the industry, the number of corporations operating it, the number of larger corporate units which control it and the market value of their stock, as of December 31, 1929.

Industry	Number of Companies	Controlling Companies	Market Value
Copper	67	12	$1,450,000,000
Chemicals	189	17	1,902,177,000
Agricultural implements	87	10	641,899,000
Iron and steel	217	25	2,114,115,000
Automobiles	187	23	2,630,359,000
Tires, rubber	115	13	945,062,929
Electrical equipment	71	11	2,319,000,000
Food products:			
Baking and flour	95	9	637,090,000
Candy, soft drinks	43	9	392,595,000
Dairy products	236	6	530,118,000
Foods	119	15	1,471,142,000
Meat packing	203	8	291,049,000
Railroad equipment	131	17	845,139,000
Telephone and telegraph	627	3	4,433,643,000
Films	74	6	393,296,000
Auto equipment	160	33	658,784,000
Total	2621	217	$21,655,468,929

All this may seem to be too vast to be brought under the domination of a few investment companies. We should not be too sure of this. Investment trusts alone have assembled three billion dollars in the brief space of half a dozen years. It is possible that other forms of investing companies have brought together another billion. If we add to this the funds of insurance companies, endowments and other corporate funds available for owning common stocks, we have several billions more. The accumulation in America of funds available for investment is one of the staggering phenomena of this generation. And almost every influence in our system is working to drive these mounting totals of investment funds into investment companies of various types. Nothing can stop them. Our little market crash will pass out of men's minds very swiftly and the onward march of the investment trusts and investment companies will proceed with increasing swiftness. And, of course, as they have the funds to invest, as they will be in the market always for the best stocks, and as all stocks sooner or later come into the market, nothing can prevent the stocks of our important and profitable industries from coming into their hands.

Indeed, this march of stocks into the vaults of the corporate stockholders is at present well under way. We know it has already practically taken place in the case of the utility companies. Take our telephone system, some 627 corporations. These are all in the hands of three big companies, two of which are chiefly big holding companies. Take our railroads. We have some 2,000 railroad corporations, including the terminal companies. The stock of these companies amounts to some $9,000,000,000. Slowly the ownership of this stock has centered in about twenty-two companies, with assets of $3,500,000,000. Thus, almost two-thirds of our railroad stock is owned by other railroad corporations. Of the $3,500,000,000 of stock in the owning companies, about $200,000,000 is held by insurance companies and not less than $1,000,000,000 by holding companies, investing companies, trusts, endowments, and other corporations. And so of our railroad stock—$9,000,000,000 in all—we can trace all but about $2,000,000,000 (22 percent) to corporate stockholders.

One of the steel mergers now occupying the attention of the newspapers—that of Republic Iron and Steel with the various companies in the Otis-Eaton group—has been largely engineered and financed through the offices and funds of an investment trust. The common stock of our banks is rapidly coming into the hands of holding companies and investment companies and investment trusts. One of the largest dealers in bank stocks in Wall Street confirms me in the belief that before many years have passed there will be left hardly a single individual bank-stock owner. All shares will be in the hands of corporate stockholders.

The present tendency seems to be toward the organization of investment trusts to buy common stocks and the formation of holding companies to control the investment trusts. If this investment-trust movement, then, is unchecked; if the picture of ownership which I have drawn is accurate, we

shall see the ultimate ownership of all our industrial machinery in the hands of the investment trusts, and the control of the investment trusts securely lodged in the hands of a few holding companies. In other words, by means of the investment trusts, our banker-promoters are going to do for the producing industry precisely what they have done for the utility industry. They are going to entangle it in a mesh of investment and holding companies so intricate that we shall never be able either to untangle it or reach effectively the men who dominate it.

The immediate and important thing to be done, therefore, is to halt, if we can, this movement by bankers to control investment trusts with little or no actual capital, either by means of tricky capital-share devices or by pyramiding holding companies. I have no doubt that legislatures will slowly awake to the need of protecting investors from the abuses by means of which trust managers inflict losses on them. They will not, I fear, show an interest in preventing promoters from getting control of the trusts. How these trusts should be managed, what part they should play in influencing the management of the industrial corporations whose stocks they hold, how they may be made to serve best the interests of investors without losing sight of the interests of the public whose productive machines they own—all these are difficult and troublesome problems which, so far, we are hardly able to deal with. But certainly, as these institutions go forward, they should be kept free from exploitation and promoter control, so that when we do understand them a little better, we may not be hampered in dealing with them by such a complex and bewildering tangle as confronts us now in our utility industry.

Who shall control our industries? Our capitalists who are the stockholders? Or the managers? There are many who believe that stockholder control is by no means the soundest; that the stockholder is a thoroughly anti-social character with no interest or pride in the corporation whose shares he holds and no thought for any feature of his investment save its security, its market price and its returns. This is undoubtedly true. It is conceivable —indeed, it is probable—that management is more interested in the development of the industry, its progress, its service and its integrity. But we ought to be sure of what we mean by management.

It happens that in most of our very large industrial enterprises management is of two kinds. Ordinarily, when we pronounce the word, we are thinking of the operative management—the management that works in the industry, directs its productive function, marshals its men, supervises its machines and distributes its products. But there is another management, too, which deals with wholly different functions of the enterprise—the management that is interested in the enterprise, not as a producer of products, but as a producer of profits, and profits derived not merely from the sale of its goods and services, but from the exploitation of the industry—the management that sits more or less removed from the plants and close to the treasury, that is interested mainly in the grand strategy of the finances, that is busy with mergers and stock issues—the gentlemen, in short, who manage the internal politics of the business and control and direct the financial affairs of the company. It is this management, and not the usually efficient operative management, which in most cases has control of the enterprise. During the last few years, the operating managers of a few large industries have been struggling into the saddle. Here and there they have succeeded in displacing the former control of the banker. The investment-trust movement, as guided by its present sponsors, will soon correct all that. It will reroute industry, wherever it has escaped, back into the hands of its promoter rulers.

If we should succeed, however, in freeing the investment trusts from promoter control, and if, as I have predicted in these articles, they should end by gaining possession of our leading industries, would not the directorates of the investment trusts become in their turn the dictators of industry? They would. This is precisely what is going to happen. And because of this fact, we must make doubly sure that these directorates do not get beyond our power to deal with them.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Mr. Flynn has written a fifth, additional article in his series in which he discusses the characteristics of good investment trusts, from the investor's point of view, outlining a series of tests by which it is possible to tell whether an individual trust is being properly conducted. He also discusses the question of possible state and federal legislation, desirable to remedy the abuses described in his first four articles, and tells the experience of Great Britain in this regard. His article will appear in The New Republic next week.—THE EDITORS.

City Streets

Look! Under that gray tower a meadow lies
Soft with the touch of spring, dew-wet and cool.
Along the crashing street a blackbird flies
Home to her nest beside a reedy pool.
And where those lofty arches leap the bay,
Swinging like cobwebs through the smoky air,
Mark how that circling falcon cleaves his way
Through winds forever sweet and skies as fair.

You cannot see them, bird or grass or rills?
You cannot hear them, wind or wave or song?
You cannot feel the quietness that thrills
Beneath the trampling foot-beats of the throng?
How then, dark watcher, shall your eyes descry
Bright youth and wonder in these passers-by?

HAROLD T. PULSIFER.

Washington Notes

WITH the Illinois primary over, political attention is almost entirely centered upon the Republican contest in Pennsylvania which comes to a climax early next month. As I pointed out last week in this place, there are many interesting phases of this fight. The only one upon which I want to comment at this time is the extraordinary fact that the notorious Mr. Vare is stronger and more dominant now in the politics of his state, and therefore a larger factor in his party nationally, than at any other period of his career. He is much more powerful than he was after his election to the Senate in 1926. Should his Davis-Brown ticket win in May—as nearly everyone thinks it will—he will be as firmly established as the supreme boss of the state as the late Penrose ever was. When you consider that since 1926 Mr. Vare has been thrown out of the Senate as unfit to be there, that he has been denounced as a corruptionist and berated as the lowest type of machine politician in every section of the country, and that as a result of two paralytic strokes he was for a long time unable to function politically at all, his development from city boss to state boss is an interesting thing.

Equally interesting, it seems to me, is the corresponding diminution of the glamorous Mr. Mellon as a political factor in his state. For a long time the legend that the Mellons were the real power in Pennsylvania has existed. It even survived the pathetic exhibition which Mr. Mellon made of himself at the Kansas City convention. In the light of his utter inability to deliver anything in the way of support to his friend, Old Joe Grundy, the legend is now seen to be wholly without substance. To the discriminating few this has been plain since the Pepper-Vare fight four years ago. It is plain to everyone now. Vare, broken in health, practically incapacitated, repudiated by the Senate, scorned by the country, has gone up; Mellon, full of honors, health and Cabinet prestige, with a vast potential power due to his fabulous fortune, and so slicked by journalistic grease as to be almost impervious to criticism or attack, goes down. It is a remarkable state of affairs.

There is material here for much philosophic reflection in which I shall not indulge. The practical point I make, however, is that unless he should regrettably pass away in the meantime, and unless his ticket wins in May, two years from now the entire seventy-two votes of the Pennsylvania delegation to the 1932 national convention will be in the hollow of Mr. Vare's hand. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they will be in the hands of the little group of Philadelphia politicians who are using Mr. Vare as a symbol to hold intact the powerful Philadelphia machine. At any rate, the Mellons will have nothing to do with the selection of the delegates, and less with their direction. Mr. Mellon, of course, will be a member of the delegation; but he will be there by the grace of the Vare machine and will be far more negligible as an influence than in 1928—and he was not very potent then.

But let's away from the Vares and the Mellons to touch lightly upon the troubles of some of the less glittering stars in the political firmament—to wit, the political troubles at home that have occurred to two of the statesmen upon whom the high-minded Herbert conferred the distinction of representing their country abroad at the great naval-reduction conference in London. At this writing, the great conference seems plugging along in its sluggish way toward a three-power pact that, to say the least, will not be widely cheered on this side of the ocean and is sure to meet attack in the Senate. I refer to the Hon. Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas and the Hon. Dwight W. Morrow, now of New Jersey. While Senator Robinson has been laboring at London in the cause of peace and becoming addicted to morning coats and toppers (he wears his spats at home, too), a candidate—and, from what I am told, a formidable one—has popped up out in Arkansas, all inflamed with the idea of wresting Mr. Robinson's senatorial toga from his broad shoulders and placing it on his own.

His friends say that had the Senator not been in London, he could have managed the situation in his state—a state included by Old Joe Grundy in his list of backward ones—so as to have avoided a primary fight for his renomination this summer. A low advantage, they allege, has been taken of his absence. While patriotically fighting his country's battles on a foreign front, he has been attacked in the rear. The chances are that his state will stand by him, but the least he can expect is considerable trouble and expense. Moreover, it does not yet seem clear that he will return from England wearing laurels on his brow and with a sufficiently concrete achievement in the cause of peace to supply prestige enough to overwhelm the local opposition. From the Robinson standpoint the situation is particularly unfortunate, inasmuch as it slightly slows down the movement to make him the Democratic nominee for president in 1932. A rousing Robinson victory in the Arkansas primary will, of course, remove any possibility of serious injury to his presidential boom, which is being carefully and quietly nurtured. Nevertheless, this local outburst of opposition is embarrassing and exasperating to one who has his heart and hopes set on higher things.

As for poor Mr. Morrow, the distress that has piled up for him in New Jersey, where he is a candidate for the Republican senatorial nomination against the Hon. Joseph P. Frelinghuysen—who, it will be admitted, has in the past taken doses of political punishment that would have been fatal to a less optimistic and determined man—is far more acute and serious. When Mr. Morrow went away in January, there seemed practically no doubt at all that the combination of Jersey politicians behind him, headed by the estimable Baird and augmented by the weight of the Hoover administration, was easily able to bury poor Joseph once more, and secure his own nomination by a convincing vote. It does not at all seem that way now. In fact, well informed men from the state tell me the chances of Joseph's winning the primary are at least fifty-fifty, if not a shade better. You see, Joseph has had three long months in which to operate unopposed. Much can be done in three months, under such circumstances, by a man equipped with political experience and upholstered with cash. Much has been done. Sentiment favorable to Joseph has been created. Some political units in the opposing machine have been picked off. Effective use has been made of the issue of absenteeism, and the non-resident argument has been heavily stressed.

Altogether, it seems certain that when Mr. Morrow returns, instead of finding a "set-up" such as he was led to believe would exist, he will be facing a bitter primary contest—including a lot of embarrassing questions raised by a militant and confident opponent—and a doubtful outcome. Except for whatever credit may come to him from his part in effecting the three-power treaty—which credit can hardly be translated into New Jersey votes—this political dilemma will be the net reward to Mr. Morrow for his London labors in the cause of peace. But worse still, as I think I have previously pointed out, will be his troubles over the prohibition issue, if and when he gets the nomination. If he does not get it, that trouble, of course, will be shifted to Joseph. Whoever wins will certainly have it, because the simple truth is that neither is in a position to be Wet in what is probably the wettest of all states. The real Wet will be a Democratic candidate, a fact which gives him an advantage so great as to create a general impression that he will defeat either of the Republican aspirants in the general election. An idea of the embarrassment of the Messrs. Morrow and Frelinghuysen on this question can be gathered from the fact that the latter is unable to determine what stand he will take until the former reveals what his stand is, which at this moment no one knows. This seems an almost incredibly ridiculous situation, but it happens to be a fact. Another fact is that the best concession either Republican candidate can make to the concededly Wet sentiment of his state is to be mildly moist—a middle-of-the-road position which pleases nobody. It is easy to understand that the situation which confronts Joseph and his distinguished opponent is not one which they find irresistibly funny.

T. R. B.

Washington.

Cosima Wagner's Work

GEORGE MOORE has tried to persuade us that, from the hour she heard "Tristan and Isolde," Cosima Liszt von Bülow knew it was her fate to live with the man who had written it. The suggestion is typical, irresponsible and penetrating. It is not to be doubted that the impulse which drew the young woman from Bülow to Wagner, simple as it might have been, contained an ideal element. Cosima had named her daughters by the conductor after the composer's heroic inventions: Senta, Elizabeth and Isolde. And when finally she followed Wagner to Venice, it was assuredly, in part, out of an obscure, profound need of furthering a great creative work.

Her immediate contribution to it was the only peace the tormented genius ever experienced, publicly acknowledged by him in the name he gave their house in Bayreuth:

Hier, woh mein Wähnen Friede fand,
Wahnfried sei dieses Haus genannt;

less formally, but no less explicitly in the "Siegfried Idyl," composed in her honor upon the birth of their son; and privately in many letters. From Triebschen even before their marriage, in 1870, Wagner wrote of Cosima to his friend Frau Wille: "She was to prove that I could be helped, and that the statement of so many of my friends that 'I was not to be helped' was untrue. *She* knew I might be helped ,and she has helped me." Their life, meanwhile was a healthy German bourgeois one. It is highly instructive and diverting to read a certain letter of Wagner's of that time, written to one of those brilliant young men, Friedrich Nietzsche, whom like Hans von Bülow and Ludwig of Bavaria, the master drew to himself and later shamelessly exploited. The young philologist was coming from Basle to spend the Christmas holidays with his great friends; and Wagner's letter is full of minute instructions to him regarding the marionettes he is to bring along for the children's Christmas puppet play. Above all, Nietzsche is not to forget to bring one costumed like the devil. . . .

They even had their levities, those Triebschen days. Have we not a letter of the young philologist to one of his colleagues, containing the advice "Richard, Cosima and I are going to Paris to see them dance the can-can"? Years after, however, Nietzsche wrote in a different tone to Georg Brandes, that during the time of his intimate association with the pair, he had met through them "everything even halfway alive, between Paris and St. Petersburg." The bourgeois family life provided Wagner's personality with a priceless humus. It grew continentally, socially no less than artistically, effective, in those years. The creative impulse itself attested benefaction in the advanced style and accelerated processes of "Götterdämmerung" and "Parsifal." The effect of the relationship is plainly revealed by the latter work, so much its product. A spirit of mildness and faith, different from the grandiose pessimism of "The Ring," suffuses the idea and the score of "Parsifal." That is Cosima's presence at work. As Vittoria Colonna had done with the old Michaelangelo, she had, if not converted, at least assisted in reconciling, the aging Wagner to Christianity.

Then, when Ludwig of Bavaria helped Wagner build the festival playhouse dedicated to his work, Cosima superintended innumerable practical details. Collaborators in the first performance of "The Ring," in 1876, describe her playing the role of "property man." The role, however, had a wide scope. The triumph of Wagner's art took on a social significance, following as it did upon the German political triumph whose imminence it revealed. Royal and imperial visitors attended the presentation of "The Ring." French Symbolists arrived from Paris to follow the cortège of poetry under the pall of music. Young Germany came on a pilgrimage to a spiritual director. And the Villa Wahnfried had to improvise a well-nigh regal reception.

The hieratic circumstance introduced in the house in later years, however, was still absent at this time, for all the incredible satin and velvet draperies of the master's study. In any case, it was an informal group that the young d'Annunzio saw one afternoon in the early eighties on the *vaporetto* coming from the Lido; later described in a memorable passage of "Il Fuoco": Wagner, bareheaded at the prow of the vessel, savoring the wind and the sea view of Venice; Liszt, benevolent, in his long soutane; and between them, tall, consummate and serene, the wife and daughter, Cosima.

After Wagner's death, however, Cosima's hand commenced to betray her. Capable as she was, she evidently

was one of those women able to give themselves to the world only through the man, or with him. She undertook the direction of the Bayreuth festivals, but her influence did not vivify them. The performances became identified with a rigid traditionalism, a consecration of the frequently languid readings which Wagner gave his own works during his declining years. Bayreuth grew to be the seat of a deificatory Wagnerian cult which finally antagonized the world, quite as its beginnings had antagonized Nietzsche. A quasi-royal ceremonial inaugurated itself at Wahnfried. It was as though what had once breathed in Cosima had become a helpless ambition. Remarks of hers that one hears quoted sound very pompous, such, for instance, as her salutation of the budding Richard Strauss: "What, so young and already so modern!"—an expression worthy of any German bluestocking. One feels her frustration in the many ill advised attempts on the part of her weak and dutiful son, Siegfried, to create Wagnerian music-dramas. It is difficult not to see her vainly searching, through her child, for a prolongation of the relation once made so fruitful by the genius of his father.

She even tampered with the latter's memory, in the careful and garbled "edition" of his autobiography. No doubt Cosima felt the need of consolidating her somewhat compromised position with the world. The suppression of Wagner's acknowledgment of his filiation to the Jewish actor, Geyer, with whom he physically identified himself all his life—an acknowledgment which the honest Nietzsche avers that he saw—must, however, be recognized as not her work alone. One feels the hand of her son-in-law in it: the celebrated anti-Semite Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Through him, Wahnfried had become identified with romantic German politics to an extent disastrous to Germany. (The influence of Chamberlain on William II was profound to a degree not yet sufficiently appreciated.) And an indiscretion of Wagner's could not be permitted to unsettle the authorities on the matter of Germany's great historical mission, the propagation of a culture produced by the "superior" Teutonic race.

The result of this influence was disastrous to Wagnerism no less than to the Empire. The latter dragged the sum of romanticism along with it in its fall. Even before the War, Wagner's art was losing its one-time absolute immediacy. Cosima's mind was beclouded during the last years; still, it is not to be doubted that she had time to recognize the advancing unseasonableness of the vast poetic work into which the best of herself had gone. It had a place, to be sure. An age had found itself in it; but now another was searching for another expression, less slow of rhythm, less evasive of the problems of form. It is also not to be questioned that this fact, apparently so painful, could have been of no great importance to the woman in her deeper hours. Long since, Cosima must have recognized a thing which no one with the creative spark could have failed to see: that what she had assisted to birth, what she had dimly desired, and had gone from Bülow to Wagner to help bring about, was nothing of the order of things called "music," enchanting operatic and concert audiences. Nor was it the donation of spirit and an age's testament to an appreciative world.

Valuable though they were, these were ultimately but side issues of the central object of her dreams, itself nothing which might have permanence or be added to by perpetuity. For the object itself was something—state or reality—which came to be, impalpable yet positive, during the epoch in which the great Wagnerian works were culminating; something existing between Wagner and herself and the rest, which the dramas themselves but palely reflected; some spirit previously part of the all, suddenly radiantly defined from it and come to earth, filling it with days and works; and now poured back into "the burning fountain whence it came." Once that spirit had not existed. Then, gloriously, it had been; exquisite and momentary as the gesture of a dancer. What now remained of it in the Wagnerian drama was mere husks.

At a revival of "La Belle Hélène," just before the War, people caught sight of the stately old lady in a box, weeping. For a moment this spry old music of the Second Empire must have taken her back to the great days in Venice and Triebschen and Sorrento, when Wagner, and Nietzsche, and Gobineau and the rest were not yet immortals, and energy long stored in her was turning marvelously to living, and a world dimly felt within was slowly rolling into view.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

A COMMUNICATION

Concerning Count Károlyi

SIR: Count Michael Károlyi's visit to the United States has aroused a wave of criticism and has caused great confusion in public opinion. I feel, therefore, that it is a duty toward the cause for which at one time he and I were fighting in common, to elucidate as far as I can the present antagonism between Károlyi and his former followers. As The New Republic fought gallantly for his admission into this country and showed much sympathy for the struggle of Hungarian democracy, I take the liberty of asking for the use of your columns for this purpose.

All the reactionary newspapers, influenced by Budapest, have treated him as a Bolshevik. This attitude is quite natural, but it is far more astonishing that he has no backing even among his former most ardent supporters in the Liberal and Socialist camps. On the contrary, passionate voices of dissent have been heard. In the first place, the awkwardness of his political alignment was bitterly felt. Everybody knows, and Károlyi has frankly admitted, that in refusing the invitation of the Rand School in New York City he was misled by certain unscrupulous persons. Now these elements were the leaders of the so-called Anti-Horthy League, a practically nonexistent organization which serves as a masked appendage for the Communist party. In spite, however, of the cruel deception which was practised upon him by the veiled League, to the amazement of his former followers, he accepted the auspices of the same League. This is the organization which arranged throughout the country his speaking tour among the Hungarian public. Under such conditions Károlyi is traveling in a Communistic show-window.

Of course, the easiest explanation of this affiliation is the oft-repeated one that Messrs. Hughes and Kellogg were right in treating him as a masked Communist because his present behavior is a conclusive proof of his real attitude.

However, this is an explanation that does not explain. Károlyi is too proud and fearless to hide his convictions. He declared openly at a luncheon of the City Club in Cleveland, in answering a question of a "White" heckler, that a Bolshevik government in Hungary would be "an impossibility and an absurdity," and emphasized repeatedly that he is not a Communist. However, not only the *mise en scène* of his public appearances, but also the tone of his speeches, have shocked Liberals. Though they all welcomed his strong denunciation of Fascism, at the same time they resented his cruel and sardonic criticism of the Second International when he had not a single word of criticism for the Third. The impression was that his antipathy toward the Western type of Socialism is impassioned, whereas his feeling toward the Soviets is colored with an uncritical optimism. It has become manifest that his present attitude is very different from that of our common struggles more than ten years ago, when we fought for a complete democratization of Hungary, for universal suffrage, secret ballot, the expropriation of the *latifundia* and self-government for national minorities.

There can be no doubt that in the fateful years of his exile, amid misery and persecution, the Marxian philosophy of history became a kind of revelation to Károlyi, which made practically another man of him. His former liberal and democratic platform seems to him too moderate in a world which is facing, so he believes, the most profound transformation in history. The small country of Hungary appears to him too insignificant compared with his ideal of a United States of Europe, which, however, should be united, not through the trusts of the capitalists, but through the regenerating force of Socialism. Haunted by this almost mystic symbol (because he has the indomitable mystical trend of the heroes of Dostoievsky), he regards the cautious compromises of the Western labor movement with doubtful and almost ironical eyes, and denounces the Hungarian Socialist party as a traitor.

It cannot be denied that in a country so debased by feudalism and usury as present Hungary is, Magyar Socialism has also become a dark chapter in the history of the International. Its best leaders are in exile, and the terroristic system of Count Bethlen is always over the Socialist organization like a menacing sword. In all this, however, Károlyi sees only treason and does not realize the pressure under which they are working. Károlyi, with his intransigence, will no longer coöperate with them. On the other hand, he is hypnotized by the military and administrative successes of the Soviets, which he regards as a victory for Socialism. The tremendous mistakes of the proletarian dictatorship he completely overlooks. This attitude devaluates his passionate propaganda against Fascism in the eyes of a more discriminating audience which is aware of the fact that Fascism is almost a negative photographic plate of Bolshevism; the same methods, the same spirit, applied for the realization of widely opposite ends. Károlyi does not see all these difficulties. Like a knight errant of Socialism, he is running toward the unique goal, the Socialistic United States of Europe. Therefore, the only remedy which he sees is the unification of all the Socialist forces, the unification of the two Internationals for the supreme battle. This is why he uses with favor such expressions as, for instance, "We need a Socialism which would stand midway between MacDonald and Lenin." Of course, every friend of the labor movement would like to see the forces of the workers united. In spite of this, the policy advocated by Károlyi is a complete utopia for the present. As things now stand, the union of the two Internationals would mean the total suppression of the Western by the terroristic and Machiavellian methods of the Eastern.

This is why Hungarian Liberals and Socialists consider the propaganda of Károlyi detrimental, not only to the cause of unhappy Hungary, but also to that of European Socialism. There can be no doubt that the unbalanced utterances of the former leader of the October revolution have given new force to the corrupt semi-Fascist, semi-feudal system of Horthy and Bethlen. At the same time he strengthened reaction in Europe by supporting the anti-Socialist propaganda of the Moscow emissaries. Therefore it is not surprising that those who were formerly his most ardent supporters now regard his work with despair, and that some of them speak of "the collapse of the Károlyi legend." However, this last assertion seems to me untrue, because legends are not based on utilitarian considerations, but on noble aims, heroic actions and great personal sacrifices. In this respect, Károlyi is still unchanged: he has remained clean, unbroken and capable of suffering the last consequences of his stand. The tragic hero remains the hero even if he stumbles over the surrounding realities. Károlyi the statesman may fall, but Károlyi the legend will remain untouched in the minds of many suffering millions.

Oscar Jászi

Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.

[The foregoing communication was submitted to Count Károlyi by The New Republic and he was invited to submit a reply for simultaneous publication, a suggestion of which he did not take advantage.—The Editors.]

CORRESPONDENCE

Or Will It Stay at Home?

SIR: In your issue of February 5 the question "Will Hollywood Move to Broadway?" is asked and answered by Miss Frances Patterson. Her conclusions are so superficially plausible that many readers must have been convinced, and await breathlessly the transfer. However, an examination of but one of her arguments suffices to negate her entire structure.

It is no longer true, as she contends, that motion pictures, or even a small portion of them, are taken in soundproof, dismally hot compartments. For within the last few months the cinema technicians have discovered that the human voice records much better in an atmosphere of normal noise. The California climate, with all its varied facilities, is again of enormous value. This disposes of the largest part of Miss Patterson's thesis.

Also, it is rather dubious that the Broadway actor has or will supplant the Hollywood actor at the box-office. The number of New York performers who have failed to make their mark is much larger than those who have survived, and none of these has startled the nation—with but two exceptions, one a foreigner—Maurice Chevalier and Al Jolson. On the contrary, the local boys and girls seem to be holding their own quite well, commercially if not artistically.

In large, the opposite of Miss Patterson's contention seems to be coming true. Last month another film company, Pathé, closed its Eastern studio, removing it in entirety to Hollywood.

Hollywood, Calif. John Bright.

We Hereby Do

SIR: The War Department of the United States has ruled that colored gold-star mothers must be separated from white mothers on the pilgrimage they are making to the graves of their sons who died on European soil fighting for democracy.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People believes that this pilgrimage, of all places, is least appropriate to introduce color segregation. Death knew no color line among the brave Americans who gave their lives at their country's call.

We believe many Americans will feel the ignominy of this petty discrimination and will want to protest against it, and hope that your magazine will record its opposition to carrying out the proposed color bar against gold-star mothers.

WALTER WHITE.
National Association for the
New York City. Advancement of Colored People

A Congress on Mental Hygiene

SIR: Samuel Johnson observed that "every man is a rascal as soon as he is sick," and that applies to mental illness or disturbances, I suppose, more forcefully than to physical illness. Mental difficulty, we are learning, is not limited to those suffering from definite mental disease, but is in reality at the bottom of much unhappiness, inefficiency and poor adjustment.

Anyhow, at Washington, D. C., from May 5 to 10, the First International Congress on Mental Hygiene will be held, and people interested in mental hygiene from all over the world will be there. Marriage will come in for discussion; so will adolescence; so will questions affecting industrial relationships; so will crime; so will religion, or the spiritual values of mental hygiene; so will all kinds of neuroses and ambitions and fears and tricks by which we avoid reality.

We'll all be in the discussion, along with our children, whether we're there or not. The Congress, which will be attended by people possessing scientific and professional interest in mental hygiene, is open to all who have a serious interest in the subject, and the Committee on Organization extends a cordial invitation to all to attend. Medical, educational and social-welfare programs, for years to come, are likely to be affected by its deliberations.

WINTHROP D. LANE.

New York City.

More about Mr. Dakin

SIR: The discussion in The New Republic of Mr. Dakin's book about Mrs. Eddy has failed to call attention to its merits and demerits as a book. Though I am not particularly interested in Mrs. Eddy, I read biographies of all sorts, and I found Mr. Dakin very readable. But throughout the narrative the general tone of ironical humor, the undercurrent of facetiousness, diminish the effectiveness of his revelations and lead the reader to doubt the author's desire to present an unbiased picture. Moreover, in appearing ever so innocently to persecute Christian Scientists through his attack upon their leader, Mr. Dakin can only succeed in making them cling more closely to this leader. And why, after all, need we take away people's idols?

If we must be iconoclasts, we should present adequate proofs of our arguments without rancor or scoffing. And this, however probable his thesis may be, Mr. Dakin fails to do. From a scientific point of view, his footnotes are inadequate, and he has lumped his authorities together at the end of the book without references from the text. Even a serious reader is hardly likely to take the trouble to verify his unsupported statements. I have not seen Miss Milmine's book, but if it is based, as Mr. Dakin implies in his preface (p. ix) on recollections gained by "tramping up and down New England in quest of those who still remembered the Mary Baker Eddy of earlier years," one might call attention to the well established unreliability of even trained witnesses, when called upon to testify after a period of years.

Again, how did Mr. Dakin know that after Mrs. Eddy drove away alone in her closed carriage, "the white plumes nodded vigorously as she shook with constant tremor? But she continued to gaze steadily, unseeingly, straight ahead. . . ." This is not biography, but fiction.

How does Mr. Dakin know what Mrs. Eddy thought at the time of her effort to excommunicate Mrs. Stetson (p. 469); that she was distraught with fear (p. 473); that at the time of Mrs. Eddy's death "for an hour or so [her] attendants were utterly lost" (p. 518); or that "Frye was fumbling aimlessly around the room?" The long account of her removal from Concord has no documentation to show why Mr. Dakin believes as he does. How could a man like the Mr. Glover presented recall verbatim the long interview with Mrs. Eddy which is here reported (p. 425 ff.)? Any slight change in the wording due to personal feelings would entirely alter the real importance of the thought.

Mr. Dakin's closing words, together with the quotation from Plutarch in the introduction to his bibliography, seem very much like a veiled apology for having proved a traitor to his own intentions.

Philadelphia, Pa. M. M. GILLET.

A Russian Voyage for Economists

SIR: With the great interest you have displayed in news in regard to Russia and the very valuable articles on aspects of Russian affairs which you have published from time to time, I thought you might care to bring to the attention of your readers a coöperative trip that is being planned by a group of economists, primarily to learn at the source more fully about the Gosplan and the progress that is being made under it.

The party will start from Berlin July 7, reaching Moscow July 9, and devoting thirty-five days to the study of conditions in Moscow, Leningrad, the leading cities along the Volga between Nijni Novgorod and Stalingrad, the iron, steel and coal region of the Donetz Basin, and ending the journey at Kiev.

It would be a pleasure to supply any economist who may be interested with full information.

HENRY R. SEAGER.

Columbia University, New York City.

A Bill to Copyright Designs

SIR: The gravest problem confronting the creative American designer today is the current practice among unscrupulous industrialists of imitating design without compensating the designer. To put an end to this so-called "piracy," which is really common thievery, there is now before the House Committee on Patents the bill HR 7243, commonly called the Vestal Bill, providing for copyright registration of designs. The American Union of Decorative Artists and Craftsmen wholeheartedly endorses this bill and is making every effort to arouse public opinion in favor of its passage.

Works of American authors were rarely published before the book-copyright law was passed, for they could be pirated anywhere and those of English authors could be stolen without payment. The same situation now prevails in American design. France, England, Germany and Sweden have long ago passed laws protecting the original creations of designers. Only with the passage of the Vestal Bill can American design be made remunerative enough to attract able men and permit those now in the profession to do their sincerest work.

Not only does the artist, but the manufacturer as well, suffer through lack of legislative control. Mr. C. R. Clifford, editor of The Upholsterer and Interior Decorator, says that "millions of dollars are lost in the United States every year because pirating of designs makes them worthless. A manufacturer employs an elaborate staff and spends a lot of money to create artistic designs, only to have those which sell well stolen."

The dry-goods merchants are apparently alone in their opposition to this bill. Although they admit the ethical principles involved, they contend that the bill would place unfair burdens and

responsibilities on the retailer and create for him a condition of annoyance, inconvenience and expense. Proponents of the bill are having conferences with the retailers in the effort to iron out difficulties and meet the objections by changes without extracting the teeth of the proposed legislation. The House Committee on Patents seems favorably disposed toward HR 7243 and it is expected that the Vestal Bill wil be placed for consideration before the House and Senate very shortly.

C. Adolph Glassgold.

New York City.

What Drives the Machine?

SIR: Perhaps I misconstrue Professor Dewey when he says ("Toward a New Individualism," in The New Republic of February 19):

> They [the defenders of the old type of individualism] ascribe all the material benefits of our present civilization to this individualism—as if machines were made by the desire for money profit, not by impersonal science; and as if they were driven by money alone, and not by electricity and steam under the direction of a collective technology.

It is true that there is impersonal science, or rather scientists who work without the idea of money profit; and certainly some machines are made on the same moral basis. But what is actually happening about us? We have the fact that almost all inventions are patented, which in itself advertises the fact that the inventor is seeking a money gain; and, further, we know full well that the business man cannot be interested in the invention until it can be produced in a marketable and paying way. If research is backed by business it is because new inventions are looked for.

There is something mystical, it seems to me, in the belief that machines are driven, not by money alone, but by electricity and steam under the direction of a collective technology. For the collective technology, so far as I can see, is not something existing for itself, but is, by and large, the servant, or more bluntly, the wage-servant, of business. Business pays collective technology to make more profits; and collective technology, as handled in individual cases, looks for money also. The technician, in short, has to make a living.

From this standpoint it appears to me that we will get farther by an unflinching stare at the facts. American civilization certainly is unprecedented in that it is a business civilization, and business has no reason for being unless it is profitable, for an unprofitable business ceases, through liquidation, to exist.

Whether such a civilization can minister to such human needs as religion, art, love, knowledge and philosophy remains to be seen. There are such things as science, art, philosophy even today, but they fare badly in the United States unless they can, in the long run, harness up with the profit motive. That is why there is a sore and bitter fight between the individual and the collective in this country. The profit motive should not be sneered at, for it belongs, by nature, to practical men and women; but there is a large class who are of different psychological types, and who, even if they strive to gear into the business machinery, cannot really, thus producing an inner conflict with neurosis as its goal.

James Oppenheim.

New York City.

Skyscrapers in the City of the Future

SIR: I am sorry that limitations of space made me appear unjust to Mr. Hugh Ferriss in my review of his "Metropolis of Tomorrow"—his ability and sincerity both make it necessary that I should meet the objections he has raised in his letter published in your issue of April 2. As to the lighting of his great skyscraper centers, he points out that the buildings in no case are less than half a mile apart: hence he was justified in giving these structures the full benefit of sunlight. There is an obvious conflict here between Mr. Ferriss's text and his pictures. The Art Center in his city of the future shows four great masses heaped closely together: the Business Zone vista shows, according to the height of the buildings, much less than half a mile between them: the same holds of the Art Zone; while again in the illustration of the center of finance, the light falls on surfaces which would, in fact, be under shadows far deeper than the upper part of the building. This is a trick of illumination by which Mr. Ferriss has endowed existing skyscrapers—see his earlier illustrations—with a faëry quality they do not in fact possess. The same unreality carries over into the whole program of the City of the Future, as outlined by Mr. Ferriss and the architects with whom he has been associated. Skyscrapers have come into existence because of the profits and rents that can be wrung out of congestion in our present financial regime: if Mr. Ferriss is prepared to revolutionize our economic system and keep skyscrapers from being built closer than half a mile apart, the whole pyramid of ground rents that skyscraper building has created will tumble to the ground; and in this case the skyscraper will be smashed as completely and irrevocably as Humpty-Dumpty. As long as our present financial system is intact, Mr. Ferriss's City of the Future is as far from actuality as Campanella's City of the Sun: should this system collapse or disintegrate or be overthrown—and every humane, intelligent person will, I think, look forward to one or another of these happy alternatives—it would be a piece of gratuitous folly to preserve, as an architectural form, the monstrous structures which, as here conceived, lack both scale and any definite relation to human purpose. If Mr. Ferriss believes in making human purpose uppermost—and I think that he does—he has still chosen the wrong method for achieving this.

Lewis Mumford.

New York City.

The Hewitt Reforestation Bill

SIR: The dweller in New York who goes for rest and refreshment to our State Forest Preserve should be among the first to help safeguard and extend this great playground of the public and to come forward when it is in danger of exploitation.

Article VII, Section 7, of our state Constitution, originally drafted by Elihu Root (and so ably drafted that it has withstood many attacks) is the great bulwark of defense of our forest preserve, and should be jealously guarded by all public-spirited citizens who are looking toward the future. It is our natural hope that our present forest preserve will be extended throughout most of our forest-preserve counties, since they were designated for that very purpose in our state Constitution; but the present proposal to amend Article VII, Section 7, in the form of the Hewitt Reforestation Bill, provides that this constitutional protection shall not apply to any extension of our forest preserves.

This bill would allow commercial lumbering operations by the state, and the sale of trees to lumber companies, on state lands bought from now on for the purpose of extending the area of the public playgrounds. Experience has shown that a continual conflict will result between commercial and non-commercial interests.

While we believe that the reforestation program is excellent, we submit that it is not necessary to amend the Constitution to plant trees, nor to amend the Constitution at this time to cut trees twenty or thirty years hence.

Besides, there are several million acres suitable for reforestation outside the forest-preserve area. If we also keep in mind the fact that half of the Adirondack park is privately owned and affords ample opportunity for private enterprises without taking any of the land which belongs to the public, it seems only reasonable to insist that scientific forestry and commercial activities should be applied to the great area outside, before the playground is taken for any such purpose.

In view of the history of Article VII, Section 7, first written into our Constitution in 1894, endorsed and strengthened by the constitutional convention of 1915, and defended against the attack of commercial interests many times, should we not refuse to surrender this protection for our forest preserve as a whole, as the Hewitt Reforestation Bill proposes?

Ethel E. Dreier,
President, Women's City Club of New York.

New York City.

A Preface to Hart Crane

The Bridge, a Poem, by Hart Crane. Limited edition. Paris: The Black Sun Press. 96 pages. $10. Trade edition. New York: Horace Liveright. 82 pages. $2.50.

"THE POETRY of Hart Crane is ambitious," said Allen Tate at the beginning of his valuable introduction to "White Buildings." Four years later, in reviewing Crane's second book of poems, I can only make the statement again, but this time for a different reason. The ambitiousness of his earlier work was shown partly in tone, in its assumption of the grand manner, and partly in its attempt to crowd more images into each poem—more symbols, perceptions and implications—than any few stanzas could hold or convey. The result in some cases was a sort of poetic shorthand which even the most attentive readers could understand with difficulty. In this second volume, merely by making the poems longer, he has made them vastly more intelligible. His ambition, which has grown with his achievement, is now chiefly shown in his choice of subject.

"The Bridge" is a unified group of fifteen poems dealing primarily with Brooklyn Bridge. But the bridge itself is treated as a symbol: it is the bridge between past and future, between Europe and the Indies; it is the visible token of the American continent. And, although this book of poems—this one massive poem divided into eight sections and fifteen chants—begins with a modest apostrophe to a bridge over the East River, it ends bravely as an attempt to create the myth of America.

We might well conclude that such an attempt was foredoomed to failure. An ambitious subject is by definition a subject rich in platitudes; nor is this its only danger. A poet who chooses such a theme, and who, by power of imagination or intensity of feeling, escapes the platitudinous, is tempted to assume the role of a Messiah. Many ambitious poems are both messianic and commonplace, but "The Bridge," I think, is neither. In its presumptuous effort the poem has succeeded—not wholly, of course, for its faults are obvious; but still it has succeeded to an impressive degree.

The faults of "The Bridge" I shall leave to other reviewers. As for the causes of its artistic success, they are not mysterious; they are complicated. They depend on the structure of the volume as a whole, which in turn is too elaborate, too much a fabric of interwoven strands, to be explained in the present review. Instead of advancing a few vague statements, I prefer to suggest Crane's general method by describing in detail one of the fifteen poems. But which? . . . The poem that suggests itself is possibly his best; probably it is one of the important poems of our age, but it is not immeasurably better than others in the book—"Cutty Sark," for example, or "The Dance," or "Ava Maria"—and its method is neither too simple nor too complex to be typical of his work. Let us confine ourselves, then, to "The River."

It occurs in the second section of the book, a section bearing the name of Pocahontas, whom the poet has chosen as an earth-symbol to represent the body of the American continent. She also represents its Indian past. The section dedicated to her consists of five poems, each of which progresses farther into the continent and into the past, till the Indian tradition fuses, in the fifth poem, with that of the settlers. It should be noted, however, that the progression is not geographical or historical: it is a progressive exploration of the poet's mind. Thus, in the first poem of the series, he awakens to the dim sounds of the harbor at dawn; in the second he walks to the subway attended by the imaginary figure of Rip Van Winkle. In the fourth poem, he will picture a corn-dance held by the Indians before the first settlers landed on the marshy banks of the James. The third poem, with which we are dealing to the exclusion of the others, must serve as a link between the second and the fourth—between present and past, between New York City and the Appalachian tribes. Thus, it must have a movement both temporal and spatial, a movement like that of a river; and the subject Crane has chosen to perform this double function is the Mississippi.

His treatment of the subject is oblique; he does not proceed logically, but rather by associations of thought, by successive emotions. Since the preceding poem has ended in a subway, it seems emotionally fitting to begin the present one, not on the Mississippi itself, but on a train westbound from Manhattan into the heart of the continent. From the windows of the Twentieth Century Limited, the poet watches the billboards, drifting past. And the first eighteen lines of this long poem are a phantasmagoria of pictures and slogans, an insane commentary on modern life, an unstable world as seen in glimpses by a moving observer.

Suddenly the angle of vision changes. The poet is no longer on the train; he is standing beside three ragged men "still hungry on the tracks . . . watching the taillights wizen." The rhythm of the poem changes at the same moment: it is no longer nervous and disconnected; it settles down to the steady pedestrian gait of hoboes plodding along a railroad. The next ninety-three lines, by far the longest section of the poem, will deal with the Odyssey of these unshaven men, "wifeless or runaway," of whom Crane once said in explaining his methods: "They are the leftovers of the pioneers. . . . Abstractly, their wanderings carry the reader through certain experiences roughly parallel to those of the traders and adventurers, Boone and others."

From the long passage that deals with these wanderings, I remember many lines, some for their vividness or wit, some for their music, and some for the imaginative quality that is poetry in the strictest sense:

> "There's no place like Booneville though, Buddy,"
> One said, excising a last burr from his vest,
> "For early trouting. . . ."
>
> John, Jake or Charley, hopping the slow freight
> —Memphis to Tallahassee—riding the rods,
> Blind fists of nothing, humpty-dumpty clods.
>
> —They know a body under the wide rain;
> Youngsters with eyes like fjords, old reprobates
> With racetrack jargon—dotting immensity,
> They lurk across her, knowing her yonder breast
> Snow-silvered, sumac-stained or smoky blue—

Lurking across immensity, they wander wherever the Mississippi "drinks the farthest dale." In Ohio, "behind my father's cannery works," they squat in a circle beside the tracks. They remember "the last bear, shot drinking in the Dakotas." Drifting through the Missouri highlands, they linger where—

> Under the Ozarks, domed by Iron Mountain,
> The old gods of the rain lie wrapped in pools—

and inevitably they gather at Cairo, where the waters gather. "For," says the poet addressing these belated pio-

neers—"For you, too, feed the River timelessly." The poem, after wandering over half the country, has found its proper subject. And at this point the rhythm changes once more; it becomes slower, more liquid; and finally, in a series of eight majestic quatrains, the river and the poem flow southward together, passing De Soto's burying place, passing "the City storied of three thrones," and mingling with the Gulf.

Even from this bare outline of one poem, one can glimpse the qualities by which the ambition of the volume is transformed into realization. Here is the conceptual imagination that resolves a general subject into an individual experience—one which it again dissolves into something universal and timeless. Here is the concrete imagination that reveals itself in terms of sound, color and movement. Here, lastly, is the constructive imagination that makes each separate poem play its part in a larger plan. As for the place of "The River" in this plan, I think I have shown that it succeeds in the two functions it was called upon to perform. At the same time, considered apart from the volume as a whole, it has a life of its own; and it has a separate structure also, one which might be compared to that of an ideal Chrysler Building. Just as the building stands broadly in a rubble of houses, narrows to a tower, rises implacably story after story, and finally soars upward in one clean shaft; so the poem, which began as a crazy jumble of prose and progressed by narrowing circles into the Great Valley, develops finally into a slow hymn to the river, a celebration of the Mississippi as it pours "down two more turns—"

> And flows within itself, heaps itself free.
> All fades but one thin skyline round. . . . Ahead
> No embrace opens but the stinging sea.
> The River lifts itself from its long bed,
>
> Poised wholly on its dream, a mustard glow
> Tortured with history, its one will—flow!
> —The Passion spreads in wide tongues, choked and slow,
> Meeting the Gulf, hosannas silently below.

MALCOLM COWLEY.

Three Soldiers

Sherman: Soldier, Realist, American, by B. H. Liddell Hart. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 456 pages. $5.

The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant, by J. F. C. Fuller. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 451 pages. $5.

Marse Robert, Knight of the Confederacy, by James C. Young. New York: Rae D. Henkle Company. 362 pages. $5.

PEOPLE whose historical information comes from the most superficial essays . . . have created an almost mythological figure of Robert E. Lee as a great general, worthy forever to stand beside the great commanders of all time." Captain Elbridge Colby wrote this opinion in Current History for October of last year, and although it is not quoted in any of these three biographies, it is a good negative statement of the viewpoint of Captain Hart and Colonel Fuller in their impressive books on Sherman and Grant. I quote from Captain Colby's essay, not to call attention to heresy in American history, but because it is one of seven essays I have read in two years which question not only the genius of Lee but the superiority of Confederate leadership as a whole. Grant and Sherman are being placed above Lee, and Jackson is becoming a general who fought a brilliant minor campaign in the Shenandoah Valley. Mr. James C. Young's somewhat impressionistic biography of Lee does not, however, belong to the rising new school of Civil War history. The books by Hart and Fuller give it powerful support. They are carefully documented, and, as a rule, ably written. The authors are authorities on the art of war. These two books will doubtless mark an epoch in the military history of the war between the states.

They are not without conspicuous faults. Captain Hart's style is occasionally graphic, but it is more often mannered, and his book is over-written because he prefers using fifteen words to expressing his thought more clearly in ten. It is not merely a defect of the surface; it in part obscures one of the most interesting purposes of the book—the defense of General Sherman's long-lost, bewildering moral character. Sherman is buried under the style of Captain Hart, and the apology for the monster of two Southern generations loses in psychological reality. The character of Sherman is not made quite coherent.

It was coherent in the man himself, but it was complex, and it is the complexity which may have puzzled his biographer; for he tries to attribute to it a homogeneous morality: because Sherman was intelligent and in many respects noble, there must have been an intelligent and noble reason even for the outrages he committed. Captain Hart freely admits Sherman's inexplicable conduct in Georgia, but such lapses are not conceived dramatically and they are not explained in Sherman's character as a whole. The result is an appearance of special pleading: some of the more discreditable evidence is suppressed, such as the general's attempt, after the war when military necessity could not excuse it, to vilify Jefferson Davis. Sherman pretended he had found, in North Carolina, a letter signed by Davis betraying a personally ambitious plot to bring on secession. Sherman's campaign in Georgia, the most remarkable in the war, made him, according to Captain Hart, the best general on either side.

Colonel Fuller says that Grant was the best general. Although the analysis of Grant's strategy and tactics leans heavily on the highly partial narrative by Grant's hero-worshipper, Adam Badeau, it is based upon a thorough survey of the official records of the Union and Confederate armies, in fifty-two volumes. Grant was the first tactician in the modern sense. His hammering tactics, the bloody method of throwing his men against the enemy in frontal attacks, was, says Colonel Fuller, the first example of modern warfare. The rifle bullet, with its range and power to kill, had revolutionized tactics; it necessitated the constant use of trenches, and the constant fighting of armies locked in prolonged struggles, as it did in the Great War. Grant understood this. Lee, on the other hand, was only a fair tactician without strategical imagination. He actually crippled the strategy worked out by the Davis government! It is difficult to believe that Colonel Fuller understands Lee's unfavorable circumstances as well as he does Grant's lack of them after 1863.

This is a brilliantly one-sided book. It is one-sided in another respect. The author, as philosopher, expounds the blessings of war in general, the benefits of the Civil War in particular (which brought the industrial system of society), and the genius of Henry Ford, another great strategist. Just why automobiles should be made either efficiently or inefficiently, or war fought well or ill, the author does not explain very convincingly.

Mr. Young's interesting book about Lee is the record of an heroic career, from which many of the heroic details are missing. Some of them appear at the end in the course of the author's speculations as to whether Lee's failure to

win was due partly to his own too perfect character. In this book, however, the official records have not been extensively used.

ALLEN TATE.

Personal Problems

Stephen Escott, by Ludwig Lewisohn. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

IN "STEPHEN ESCOTT" Mr. Lewisohn presents three men, marries them off, and compares the results. Stephen Escott marries the first presentable girl for whom he feels any affection, and she turns out to be a petty, unemotional creature who confuses passion with grossness and worldliness with breeding. His friend Oliver Clayton, a wealthy fellow, but, I fear, a trifle weak, espouses a Miss St. Preux of the Beaufort, South Carolina, St. Preuxes, "a large, proud, handsome girl, whose distinguished lineage and standing compensated amply for her family's narrow means." But apparently it takes more than a large, proud, handsome girl to keep poor old Oliver in happy health and spirits, for at any crisis in his life he slumps down in the large chair in the expensive office of his luxurious publishing house and goes all to pieces. So far, so bad. Two marriages have bit the dust, one moderately circumstanced and bourgeois, one wealthy and aristocratic. What will Mr. Lewisohn do now? Well, for one thing, he cannot leave the field to the Nordics, even if they all meet with defeat.

So in trots little David Sampson, Stephen's Jewish friend and law partner. David marries a sensible, pretty girl of his own race, they have a cozy house in the Bronx, after years of living together they still behave like lovers, and they make lovely ironic remarks to their Anglo-Saxon friends by the simple process of using the world "Jewish" where the adjective "Christian" is ordinarily employed—such as telling kind-hearted people that they have a really Jewish nature. In their smugness they are almost as unpleasant as Stephen's narrow-minded wife. Mr. Lewisohn is utterly incapable of convincing character portrayal. Even Stephen is a ridiculous figure. He lives a consciously miserable sex-starved married life for years without ever doing anything about it; he doesn't even dare suggest to his spouse that they have separate beds, not to mention separate rooms, although she is not a particularly forbidding person, and, for that matter, would probably have welcomed the suggestion with cheers. When she dies, Stephen begins to step out, making up for lost time. He has an affair with Beatrice, who lives in Washington Mews, smokes incessantly, wears Chinese robes, has sad, detached eyes, crouches on divans, and is unquestionably the author's idea of a hot number. Of short duration, this affair isn't much more satisfactory than Stephen's marriage, the moral being that too much passion is just as bad as too little. For the golden mean we must turn to passion under intellectual control, exemplified by the *famille* Sampson.

The obvious fault of "Stephen Escott" is that it is so determinedly a *pièce-á-thèse*. The characters are puppets whose actions spring not from themselves but from the author's obsession with certain ideas. In themselves these ideas are interesting, but Mr. Lewisohn's morbid sensitiveness is such that the conclusions he reaches are as prejudiced as his most biased characters. To prove his points he converts his stage into a laboratory and his men and women into carefully segregated guinea-pigs. In this book, for example, we see only six or eight people, each of whom proves something. They never seem to associate with anyone else, which in real life would be impossible, as they are all active inhabitants of a large city. Of course, if Mr. Lewisohn ever allowed them to have any kind of a social life, it might take their mind off their troubles, and if he allowed them to develop their minds they might have some interests, and all this would keep them from talking exclusively about their personal problems, which would be a great boon to the reader, but would put Mr. Lewisohn, who is nothing if not a personal-problem man, into a dreadful hole. Moreover, his style, except in an occasional natural description, is awkward and self-conscious. Here is an account of the birth of the tender passion: "A slight but intense vibration seemed to start in my belly and to rise to my chest. Then it was as though my heart were beating palpably against my ribs." "Grave" is Mr. Lewisohn's favorite adjective. A man says something to a woman; she gives "a grave little nod." The next page she looks at him "very gravely." The page after, she looks "somber." The funny part is that they are having quite a cheerful carnal conversation. Even the sunshine assumes a lugubrious aspect when Mr. Lewisohn appears on the scene: "A great, white noon stood gravely still over Menton as I got out of the train."

GEOFFREY T. HELLMAN.

Pablo Casals

Pablo Casals, by Lillian Littlehales. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 217 pages. $3.50.

THE Catalans are used to continuous labor from childhood, and are said to be able to "produce bread from stone." Casals is one of them, and there is something about the man and the "arrogant impersonality" of his 'cello playing which suggests the fact and circumstances of his origin.

Miss Littlehales emphasizes this impersonal and serious bias in Casals. For although he is one of the very greatest of living executants, there is nothing flamboyant about him, and no tendency whatever to virtuosity for its own sake. He is known generally as a 'cello player only, but he is a highly intelligent and serious musician who happens to be a composer and conductor as well.

It is natural, therefore, that he should believe that "talent is a normal thing," and that "ordinary people hold unguessed faculties." His own orchestra in Barcelona ("few of them players of more than ordinary ability") is a vindication of this attitude. Begun under difficult and even hostile circumstances, Casals carried it through in spite of illness, heavy financial losses and deliberate discouragement on all sides. Today it is one of the best orchestras in the world, and in one or two respects, at any rate, probably the best. And it is self-supporting! This in itself is unusual—although it may be explained in part by the fact that Casals still accepts no salary for his labors as conductor.

Quite as remarkable are his series of concerts for working men, in which "anyone with a wage of over 500 pesetas a month is refused admission!" These have been very successful, and the results, as far as an intelligent appreciation of the music is concerned, quite astonishing.

The book, written in an intimate and slightly extravagant style by another 'cellist, gives a clear picture of the man, and has an excellent last chapter on Casals' notions as to intelligent fingering and "expressive intonation."

JEFFREY MARK.

The Click Theory

The Profession of Poetry, by H. W. Garrod. New York: Oxford University Press. 270 pages. $4.50.

MOST OF these lectures were delivered during Professor Garrod's tenure of the Chair of Poetry in Oxford from 1923-8 and deal with subjects ranging from a discussion of "pure poetry" to the work of Wordsworth and Rupert Brooke. But, despite the variety of Professor Garrod's choice of subjects, his method of treatment is distinctly limited and unsatisfactory.

Professor Garrod is partial to romanticism. Consequently those portions of his lectures in which he attempts to theorize or criticize are singularly diffuse and inadequate. Leading nowhere, they leave the reader with an exasperated sense of wasted words and not a little suspicious of the author's powers of discrimination. Romanticism has no place in criticism. And it is not only incongruous but even harmful when it gives rise to such futilities as the "click theory" in order to explain the poetic response. In his lecture on "Poets and Philosophers," Professor Garrod writes:

> The click theory goes a little further. Something is said; and all the wards at once of the infinitely mysterious mechanism of our human nature, turn; all the parts of us meet decisively, yet softly, falling into place with that swift noiseless click which is the unresisting assent of the totality of what we are. You may say a trick has been put upon us, that this is not truth but persuasion. And the only answer is that you cannot put a trick upon the whole of what we are. Only the supreme hand can move so the marvelous mechanism, can thus deftly turn the key in the oiled wards.

To a group of weary students in a lecture room such a theory is doubtless very soothing. It obviates the necessity of any fatiguing intellectual process and thereby easily produces on its own behalf "the unresisting assent of the totality of what we are." But in the better ventilated atmosphere of the study it must be evident that Professor Garrod has provided nothing more substantial than a metaphorical smoke-screen. His willingness to accept and promulgate such a nebulous theory is in keeping with and probably springs from his belief regarding poets and their work. He says: "That it is possible for the poet to analyze his processes, I have never thought, for I have thought them always to be processes of inspiration." It is this submission to the idea that a poet is "a being essentially mysterious" and that the processes of poetic creation are "processes of inspiration" which conducts Professor Garrod to a correspondingly cloudy explanation of the poetic response. The much simpler idea, that the poet in writing poetry and the reader in reading poetry consciously employ their intelligence and reason, although apparently disregarded by Professor Garrod, would lead to more interesting and tangible conclusions than are achieved by his "click" and "inspiration" theories.

Professor Garrod's attitude towards poetic creation and response is indicated by remarks scattered here and there in the body of his lectures. But it is evident that the same romanticism and loose thinking which permit such an attitude must be held accountable for the undiscerning way in which Professor Garrod appraises certain authors. For example, he refers to Rupert Brooke as "the best of our recent poets" and "supposes" that Stevenson was a greater poet than Meredith or Hardy. Such estimates indicate one of two things, either a complete poverty of taste and judgment or an undiscriminating enthusiasm for the personality in poetry. In Professor Garrod's case, the latter is indicated. For not only is he at his best when he touches on the personality of the writers with whom he is concerned, but he declares that he likes "a criticism which is a degree more human" than that which would exclude the consideration of a poet's personality from a criticism of his poetry.

However, Professor Garrod is a witty and amiable instructor and these lectures are entertaining. Only when he discusses "The Nightingale in Poetry" and Mr. Humbert Wolfe's verses is he dull and unreadable, and these lapses are doubtless due to the limitations imposed by the subjects themselves. Professor Garrod has a scholar's eye for literary influences and the most stimulating parts of his book are those in which he remarks the creative interdependence of Wordsworth and Coleridge, the influence of the "Biographia Literaria" on Shelley's "Defense of Poetry," and Mr. A. E. Housman's poetic debt to Stevenson.

J. L. SWEENEY.

Canfield

Canfield, by Alexander Gardiner. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 350 pages. $2.50.

THIRTY years ago Richard Canfield's house on Forty-fourth Street was the most luxurious gambling house in America. It was furnished expensively but with taste, fine paintings hung on the walls, the best food and wine were served free of charge to the guests, but anyone who started playing with less than five hundred dollars was not encourged to come a second time. Reginald Vanderbilt celebrated his twenty-first birthday by losing seventy thousand dollars at Canfield's; men like John W. Gates, Payne Whitney, Mortimer Schiff and Jesse Lewisohn were often to be seen there. Canfield also had places at Saratoga and Newport; it was years before the police got the better of him and forced him to close. Mr. Gardiner shows his struggles with the law, the elaborate way in which he ran his establishments, and the man himself. Canfield was no common gambler; his apparatus was always beyond reproach; he did not care primarily for money, but liked to do things in the grand manner. He had self-respect, and, for a man with little formal education, was extremely cultivated. All his life he read a great deal; he spent much of his money on art, and was a great friend of Whistler's. When someone asked him what he would do if he had his life to live over, he said he would become a professor of English; he could imagine no more pleasant way of spending a lifetime. This may be taken with a large grain of salt, but it is not entirely buncombe: Canfield's picturesqueness is more than superficial, and Mr. Gardiner has done him justice in this biography.

G. T. H.

Notes on Novels

The Company, by Edwin Seaver. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.

MR. SEAVER'S chief power seems to be the power to denude. Here he uses it to show that the environment of a big publicity office in a big power company is a bad environment. In eleven short episodes and a rapid-fire introductory chapter, Mr. Seaver parades sample histories of these people from the president down to the greenest clerk. He covers a lot of ground. Many varied

THEATRE GUILD PRODUCTIONS

HOTEL UNIVERSE

A New Play by PHILIP BARRY

MARTIN BECK THEA. 45th St., West of Broadway. Evgs. 8:40; Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:40.

A MONTH in the COUNTRY

By IVAN TURGENEV

GUILD Theatre, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evenings 8:30 — Matinees Thurs. and Sat., 2:30

The Apple Cart

BERNARD SHAW'S POLITICAL EXTRAVAGANZA

ALVIN THEA. —52nd Street, West of Broadway.— Evgs. 8:30; Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:30.

TIFFANY presents **"JOURNEY'S END"**

The all-talking screen version of R. C. Sherriff's World-Famed Play with a powerful cast headed by COLIN CLIVE, creator of the stage role of Captain Stanhope.

GAIETY THEATRE, Bway & 46th St., —Twice Daily 2:45—8:45—

3 times Sat., Sun., & Holidays, 2:45-5:45-8:45
Midnight Show Every Saturday Night
Seats selling 4 weeks ahead

The Actor-Managers Inc., has the honor to present **RUTH DRAPER** IN HER ORIGINAL CHARACTER SKETCHES

Evgs., Tues., Wed., Fri., Sun., at 8:50

COMEDY Theatre 41st Street, East of Broadway. Matinees Thurs. and Sat. 2:30. VERY GOOD SEATS AT $1. Popular Price ($2.50). Matinee Saturday.

ADVANCE NOTICE PASS ON THE WORD PLEASE
THE MODERN CONTROVERSY

HUMANISM?

(Watch Literary Pages for Actual Subjects)

IRVING BABBITT SAYS YES — HENRY SEIDEL CANBY SAYS NO

CARL VAN DOREN SAYS NO

CARNEGIE HALL, Fri. Ev., May 9. Tickets 1-2.75

HEYWOOD BROUN 2 LECTURES — On this cock-eyed world Friday 8:30 P. M. APRIL 25 — MAY 2 — Community Church

for Reservations, Discussion Guild, Room 1002, 15 E. 40th St. Lex. 7483

If you are interested in

THE INTELLIGENT STUDENTS' TOUR OF SOCIALISM

organized by the

League for Industrial Democracy

with the assistance of The Open Road

Leaders: Dr. and Mrs. Harry W. Laidler

Leaving New York June 28, 1930 by Bremen—Returning August 23. Visiting England, Russia, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France. Membership restricted to 15.

Write immediately to

League for Industrial Democracy

112 East 19th Street, New York City

lives are laid bare by his scalpel. There is the good-looking girl who finds an emotional escape from the chastity of her life in telling ribald stories. There is the old maid who is proud of the length of her service and equally aware of its futility. There is a young man who goes home early to tell his wife he has been made office manager. He finds a stranger in bed with his wife giving her a string of pearls. The young man has not been noticed by the erring couple and decides never to let his wife know that he knows. Such is the sapping, withering, stunting effect of working for the company. The one exception to all this monotony of defeat is Aarons. Apparently he was the only Jew in the office. The bosses praised his work, but Aarons had the brains to know it was bad for him, and the courage to quit without even giving notice. Mr. Seaver has taken away some of the glory which Aarons might have had by explaining that the other workers did not like him. Mr. Seaver writes conversation in the French fashion, replacing qoutation marks by dashes. All this rat-tat-tat of alleged reality is compressed into about thirty thousand words. Every now and then there is a flash of something that asks for sympathy or raises a smile.

King Haber and Other Stories, by Alfred Neumann. New York: Alfred H. King. $2.50.

THESE three stories, two of which belong to a special school of historical melodrama, are well and strongly fashioned and can be recommended for this reason. "King Haber," translated from the German by Marie Busch, is the history of a Jewish court banker who attempted to secure for his heirs the succession to the crown. The action, which takes place during the period following the Congress of Vienna, when Metternich ruled the destinies of petty dukedoms, is driven along in violent short episodes. Much of it is given by implication, as if Browning in his most romantic mood had decided to write prose instead of verse. This is also true of "The Patriot," translated by Cyrus Brooks, which is the story of the death of the mad Tzar Paul of Russia—the same from which was taken the moving picture in which Emil Jannings acted. To this reviewer "Schoolmaster Taussig," translated by Alfred H. King, is the most powerful and exciting of the three, although the style in which it is written is both quiet and conventional. There is a vividness about this seventy-year-old hunchback as he recalls his love for a precocious girl pupil years before. Lena Wundsch died as the result of an illegal operation when she was sixteen years old. Gottfried Steffens, her classmate, was held responsible for her condition. By his suicide in the last pages Alexander Kurz, candidate teacher at the school, shows himself to have been the seducer. Gottlieb Hirzel, pastor and principal, is a benevolent character, but insists on employing only pretty housekeepers. Dr. Mateck can always find relaxation from his duties as village physician in the drinking of brandy. There is a nostalgia about this story which is sustained and satisfying.

It's Never Over, by Morley Callaghan. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

MR. CALLAGHAN wants to show how one man's execution involves his friends and relatives in disaster. Fred Thompson is hanged because he accidentally killed a policeman in a speakeasy brawl. Isabelle, his sister, broods over this fact and her brooding leads to a life of promiscuous love. Fred's friend, John Hughes, the hero of the tale, broods and also gets into trouble. Father

Mason, a Roman Catholic priest, is led by his brooding to take too much to drink. Lillian, who knew Fred years before and is the mistress of John Hughes, gets her life in a tangle by thinking about Fred's death. All the characters are uninteresting members of the lower middle class. Certain passages dealing with the sex side of these drab lives offer a vicarious thrill. If there were just one character in the story worth remembering it would be a better novel. C. A. C.

The Purple Cloud, by M. P. Shiel. New York: The Vanguard Press. $2.50.

MR. SHIEL has the coolest disregard for pedestrian laws of probability. An extravagant romanticist, a wild and lawless dreamer, he spews forth prodigious fantasies which frequently touch sublimity and are, as frequently, absurd. "The Purple Cloud," now published for the first time in America, is conceived on an even grander scale than most of his books and is executed with more conscious care for a sustained tone. On his return from a voyage to the North Pole, the hero discovers that mankind has been obliterated from the earth by a purple, peach-scented cloud of lethal gas. For twenty years he wanders the planet alone, at first unspeakably desolate, then intoxicated by a feeling of god-like power. Finally he meets a young girl who has also been miraculously spared. Remembering the wickedness and abjectness of man, he resists her for a time, but at last consents to become the new Adam of a new race. Although it is repetitious, over-long, madly improbable, the book sweeps one along in its vast current. Shiel is more than just another Jules Verne. He has the real poetic imagination, and he writes a rich, heady, intricate prose which, if one can stomach orgies of romanticism, is sheer delight. E. H. W.

A Correction

In the notes on contributors in the issue of April 9, Miss Florence Becker was incorrectly described as a teacher of Anthropology at Columbia University. Miss Becker is a student of Anthropology, not a teacher.

Contributors

ABRAHAM EPSTEIN is executive secretary of the American Association for Old Age Security. He is the author of "The Challenge of the Aged."

DR. FRANCIS CARTER WOOD is director of the Institute of Cancer Research of Columbia University.

MERRILL DENISON is a Canadian journalist whose report of the workings of the liquor-control system in Ontario is based on first-hand observation.

HAROLD T. PULSIFER is an associate editor of The Outlook. He is the author of "Mothers of Men" and "Glory of the Dawn."

OSCAR JÁSZI is an authority on European politics and economics. His latest book is "The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy."

ALLEN TATE, poet and critic, is the author of "Mr. Pope and Other Poems" and of biographies of Stonewall Jackson and Jefferson Davis.

GEOFFREY T. HELLMAN is on the editorial staff of The New Yorker and is one of the editors of a new literary magazine, The Miscellany.

JEFFREY MARK is a young English composer and writer now living in New York.

J. L. SWABEY has contributed articles and reviews to European and American magazines.

for unforgettable impressions

VISIT SOVIET RUSSIA

Continental travel comforts

From Leningrad to Moscow and down the picturesque Volga to the Caucasus or the Crimea and Ukraine. Witness, at first hand, the powerful drama of Communism on trial.

Interesting itineraries. Frequent sailings.

Write for Booklet "R"

Amalgamated Bank

Travel Dept.

11-15 Union Square, New York City

or

Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank

111 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

The Twilight of Empire *by* Scott Nearing

Author of "Black America," "Dollar Diplomacy", etc.

The manuscript of this book caused Dr. Nearing's expulsion from the Communist Party. In these pages he raises the question whether the United States has entered upon an imperialist cycle comparable to that of Rome and of other empires that have vanished.

$2.50 . . . VANGUARD . . . *At Bookstores*

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE

PROGRAM—April 18-26
AT COOPER UNION

9th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock.
Admission Free.

Friday, April 18—No Meeting.

Sunday, April 20—No meeting.

Tuesday, April 22—Mr. Norman Hilberry: "Light in the Dark."

MUHLENBERG BRANCH LIBRARY

209 West 23rd Street, at 8:30 o'clock.

Monday, April 21—Professor Karl N. Llewellyn:
LAW IN SOCIETY
"The Spoils of Control."

Wednesday, April 23—Mr. Clifton P. Fadiman:
CONTEMPORARY EUROPEAN LITERATURE
"Left Wing German Writing."

Thursday, April 24—Dr. E. G. Spaulding: "The Ways and Means of Reasoning—Reasoning in Relativity."

Saturday, April 26—Dr. Richard McKeon: "The Old and New Physics—Scientific Principles—Discoveries and Constructions."

DISCUSSION

Twelfth Year
THE GROUP
A Clearing House of Opinion for the Intellectual Adult.
meets at
AUDITORIUM—150 West 85th Street

Tuesday, April 22nd, at 8:30 P.M.
DR. ALFRED ADLER
(Eminent Viennese Psychologist)
will speak on
"LOVE AND MARRIAGE AS A TASK"

April 29th MORRIS HILLQUIT will speak on
"OUR CHANGING SOCIAL ORDER"
May 6th, FLOYD DELL will speak on:
"LOVE IN THE MACHINE AGE"
Admission:
Members, 50c. Non-members, 75c.
Membership, $1.00 for the year.
Weekly notices mailed on request.

SCHOOLS

FRIENDSHIP FARM
Stony Hill, Bethel, Conn.

A summer Play School for twenty children between two and nine years. Guided play activities stimulate the creative impulses and develop both social cooperation and individual initiative.

Continuous attention to every detail of the physical welfare of each child.

Recommended by John B. Watson, Vernon Cady, Everett Dean Martin, Charles F. Powlison, Rowland C. Sheldon, Fola La Follette, Margaret Naumburg.

Mrs. Horace M. Kallen, Director
R. D. 2, Bethel, Conn.

Mrs. W. F. Spence, Secretary
610 W. 152nd St., New York City.
Telephone, Edgecomb, 5441.
No registrations accepted after May First.

HESSIAN HILLS SCHOOL

A modern country school for boys and girls, nursery through first year high school, day and boarding.

CROTON ON HUDSON, N. Y.

SUMMER PLACES

HAYFORD'S-IN-THE-FIELD
CHOCORUA, N. H.
Est. 1894

Situated in the foothills of the Sandwich Range of Mountains; innumerable long and short walks over well marked trails; centrally located for complete tour of White Mountains in a day; individual cottages; special attention given to families with children; meals served in the main house; vegetables from our own farm; milk and cream supplied from our own State and Federal Tubercular tested herd.

Reasonable rates, Booklet.

L. D. HAYFORD, Prop.

BROOK BEND TAVERN
Monterey, Massachusetts

A small quiet exclusive Inn high in the Berkshires. Golf—boating—swimming—excellent table, fresh vegetables, fruits, special diet menus.

FOR RENT

ROCKLAND COUNTY

For Rent, stone cottage in private woods, 3 bedrooms, large living room, 2 enclosed porches, unfurnished, electricty and steam heat. Privilege tennis court and swimming pool. Fireplace wood free. Garage. Commuting 1 hour. $65.00. Ralph Borsodi, Suffern, New York.

"The Quaker Lady," Remodeled Colonial farmhouse. Superb view Adirondacks. Beautifully furnished. Own spring. Barn. Orchard. 5 bedrooms and bath. Near Hurricane Lodge and Keens Valley. $500. Address: Mrs. John Martin, Grymes Hills, Staten Island, N. Y.

Two cottages in attractive seclusion of New Jersey hills. Swimming and tennis. Rates $225 and $175 for season. For information write: R. Z. Angell, 113 Graham Street, New Brunswick, N. J.

IN THE WOODS
ANNADALE, STATEN ISLAND
Bungalow for sale, rent—two bedrooms—porches, living-room, kitchen, bath, heat, electric light, water. Apply Jago, 954 Carlton Blvd., R.F.D. Prince Bay, Staten Island, N. Y.

4-room apartment, tastefully furnished, 2 rooms overlooking Hudson, near Columbia, cool, from June 1 to September 15. References. $400. Address: Box 481, The New Republic.

FOR RENT—In beautiful Delaware Valley, 2 hours from New York, wing of private house attractively furnished, 2 bedrooms, living-room, kitchen, bath. Complete privacy. Rates reasonable by month or season. E. J. Van Arsdale, Upper Black Eddy, Pa.

POSITIONS WANTED

Young man, university graduate, two years public school teaching, successful with the handicapped child, wishes connection with school, or as tutor. Address: Box 482, The New Republic.

A woman of thirty, by profession a teacher of art and creative writing, desires an entertaining and lucrative summer position. Address: Box 483, The New Republic.

BOOKS

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!

We hold 2,000,000 of the best books—new, second-hand, out-of-print, rare—all subjects. Also Sets of Authors. Catalogue free (25 issued). Outline requirements and interests. Books sent on approval. FOYLES, Charing Cross Rd., London, England.

SCHOOL

PLAYWRITING AT N.U.

Classes in playwriting, playshop production for promising manuscripts, walking rehearsals, etc. Competitive scholarships available. For catalog write:

THE DEAN
School of Speech and Theatre Arts
Evanston, Ill.

LANGUAGES

FRENCH, SPANISH, ITALIAN, GERMAN, ENGLISH

Conversational method, Carefully selected Native teachers. Private lessons, 75c, short course, 9 to 9 daily, 18th year.
FISHER'S SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
1264 Lexington Avenue, N. W. Cor. 85th St.

GENERAL

ATHEISM

Book catalogue FREE. Tracts, 10c.
American Asso. for Advancement of Atheism
119 E. 14th St., New York, N. Y.

REAL HARRIS TWEED

The aristocrats of all sports wear—direct from makers. Sample free. Suit-lengths by Mail. Carriage Paid.
NEWALL, 159 Stornoway, Scotland.

The Perennial Questions

soon will be up with all of us with vacation time, fast approaching: What to do? Where to do it? Thousands of New Republic readers will be asking them and looking for an answer—in the columns of The New Republic, first and preferably. Your summer place, your cottage or bungalow, your inn or farm may be just the thing they're looking for.

For the special rate apply

THE
NEW REPUBLIC
421 W. 21st St., N.Y.C.
CHElsea 8393

HARD TIMES FOR FARMERS

Six articles on America's most pressing domestic problem—to be published as a symposium in The New Republic, beginning in the issue of April 30.

THE FARM BOARD AND THE FARMER

by E. G. Nourse

The Farm Board challenges the farmer's most deep rooted prepossession—his idea of himself as an "independent farmer." Will the farmer coöperate?

WHAT CAN THE TARIFF DO?

by Roland R. Renne

An examination of the four commodities on which the tariff is considered the most effective—leading to an interesting conclusion.

THE CANADIAN WHEAT POOL

by H. H. McIntyre

An illuminating explanation of Canada's huge experiment in coöperation, written by a wheat grower who is a member of the pool. He tells exactly how the pool operates and what the farmers think of it.

UNEMPLOYMENT ON THE FARM

by Arthur P. Chew

It is said that the farmer cannot be fired. A sad illusion! Thousands are fired every day. What is the cause—and the remedy?

THE MARGINAL FARMER

by Robert Stewart

If you want some four million farms to continue to exist as separate family units there is one and only one thing to do—give them a government subsidy.

CORPORATION FARMING—THE WAY OUT?

by Mordecai Ezekiel and Sherman Johnson

Describing the Fairway Farms in Montana and other new ideas in farm management, in which planned social coöperation is substituted for the blind competition of today.

Subscribe for the duration of the series **13** weeks for **$1**

THE NEW REPUBLIC
421 West 21st Street
New York City

For the attached ONE DOLLAR BILL send me The New Republic for thirteen weeks, including all the articles on *Hard Times for Farmers*.

Name.....Street.....

City.....State.....

4-23-30

118

Printed by Stellmach Press, Inc., 409 Pearl St., New York, N. Y.

MORE BARGAINS IN BOOKS

50% Savings

The books listed on our bargain page three weeks ago were sold four times over. Here are more—equally good, all unused, little or no shelf-wear. One or more copies in stock. Remit the amount shown in column "Reduced to." Postage paid anywhere in the United States. Money for books already sold, promptly refunded.

	REGULAR PRICE	REDUCED TO
Dark Laughter, by *Sherwood Anderson*	$2.50	$1.25
Love in Chartres, by *Nathan Asch*	2.50	1.25
Tinker's Leave, by *Maurice Baring*	2.50	1.25
Let's Go to the Movies, by *Iris Barry*	3.00	1.50
Pheasant Jungles, by *William Beebe*	3.00	1.50
Belphegor, by *Julien Benda*	2.00	1.00
Wild Goslings, by *William Rose Benet*	2.50	1.00
Nights Abroad, by *Konrad Bercovici*	4.00	2.00
The Logic of Modern Physics, by *P. W. Bridgman*	2.50	1.25
Scientific Thought, by *C. D. Broad*	5.00	2.50
Emerson and Others, by *Van Wyck Brooks*	3.00	1.50
Anthony Comstock, by *Heywood Broun and Margaret Leech*	3.00	1.00
Field Marshall Sir Henry Wilson; His Life and Diaries, by *Sir C. E. Callwell* 2 vols.	10.00	5.00
The Newer Spirit, by *V. F. Calverton*	2.50	1.25
The New Spirit in the European Theatre, by *Huntley Carter*	7.50	3.50
The Way of Peace, by *Robert Cecil*	3.00	1.50
The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell	5.00	2.50
The Babyons, by *Clemence Dane.* 4 vols.	5.00	3.00
The Prohibition Mania, by *Clarence Darrow*	2.50	1.25
Memoirs of Leon Daudet	3.00	1.50
Spanish Alta California, by *Alberta J. Denis*	3.50	1.75
On Love, by *De Stendhal*	3.50	1.75
The Evolution of Charles Darwin, by *George A. Dorsey*	2.00	1.00
Health and Wealth, by *Louis I. Dublin*	3.00	1.50
Archery, by *Robert P. Elmer*	5.00	2.50
Golden Tales from Flaubert	2.50	1.25
A Pilgrimage to Palestine, by *Harry E. Fosdick*	2.50	1.25
The Re-discovery of America, by *Waldo Frank*	3.00	2.00
Joseph and His Brethren, by *H. W. Freeman*	2.50	1.25
Days of Fear, by *Frank Gallagher*	2.00	1.00
Ancient Cities and Modern Times, by *Thomas Gann*	5.00	2.50
One of Cleopatra's Nights, by *T. Gautier*	2.00	1.00
Jesus: The Son of Man, by *Kahlil Gibran*	3.50	2.00
Havelock Ellis: A Biography and Critical Study, by *Isaac Goldberg*	4.00	2.50
Reflections on the Napoleonic Legend, by *A. L. Guerard*	3.75	2.00
The Dilemma of Protestantism, by *W. E. Hammond*	2.00	1.00
The Struggle for Health, by *Richard H. Hoffman*	3.50	1.75
Studies in Evolution and Eugenics, by *S. J. Holmes*	3.00	1.50
In and About Paris, by *Sisley Huddleston*	4.00	2.50
Mr. Paname, by *Sisley Huddleston*	2.00	1.00
The Mob, by *V. B. Ibanez*	2.50	1.25
The Lovely Ship, by *Storm Jameson*	2.50	1.25
Steel Chips, by *Idwal Jones*	2.50	1.25
The Higher Foolishness, by *David Starr Jordan*	2.50	1.25
The Religion of Yesterday and Tomorrow, by *Kirsopp Lake*	2.00	1.00
So You're Going to Paris, by *Clara Laughlin*	3.00	1.50
The Art of Being Ruled, by *Wyndham Lewis*	4.00	2.00
Wild Body, by *Wyndham Lewis*	$2.50	$1.25
Plato's Theory of Ethics, by *R. C. Lodge*	7.50	3.00
Donn Byrne: Bard of Armagh, by *Thurston Macauley*	2.00	1.00
Mandragola, by *N. Machiavelli*	2.50	1.25
When the Turtles Sing, by *Don Marquis*	2.00	1.00
The Challenge, by *W. G. McAdoo*	2.00	1.00
Contemporary Russian Literature, by *Prince D. S. Mirsky*	4.00	2.00
Vagabonding at Fifty, by *E. R. Mitchell and E. C. Wilson*	5.00	2.50
Poets and Their Art, by *Harriet Monroe*	2.50	1.25
The Ways of Knowing, by *W. P. Montague*	5.00	2.50
Music and Music Makers, by *Constance Morse*	3.00	1.50
Plays of the Moscow Art Theatre	3.00	1.50
Representative Plays by American Dramatists, by *Montrose J. Moses*	8.00	3.00
General Biology, by *James G. Needham*	2.50	1.25
The Devil, by *Alfred Neuman*	3.00	1.75
Pick Up the Pieces, by *"North 3-1"*	3.00	1.50
Cloud Lands of France, by *Amy Oakley*	4.00	2.00
Creative Education, by *Henry Fairfield Osborn*	2.50	1.25
Banzai, by *John Paris*	2.50	1.25
Woman's Dilemma, by *Alice Beal Parsons*	2.50	1.25
Five Murders, by *Edmund Pearson*	2.50	1.25
Shelley: His Life and Work, by *Walter Edwin Peck.* 2 vols.	12.50	7.00
The Last Salon, by *J. M. Pouquet*	3.00	1.50
A B C of Architecture, by *Matlack Price*	2.50	1.25
Anastasia, by *H. von Rathlef-Keilmann*	3.50	1.75
Standing Room Only?, by *Edward A. Ross*	3.00	1.50
The Mancroft Essays, by *A. M. Samuel*	2.00	1.00
The Mainstream, by *Stuart Sherman*	2.50	1.25
Words and Idioms, by *Logan Pearsall Smith*	2.00	1.00
Confession of a Fool, by *August Strindberg*	2.50	1.25
Autobiography of Mark Twain. 2 vols.	10.00	6.00
Young Woodley, by *John Van Druten*	2.00	1.00
The Art of Thought, by *Graham Wallas*	2.75	1.50
Wintersmoon, by *Hugh Walpole*	2 00	1.00
Century Readings in the English Essay, by *Louis Wann*	3.50	1.75
Emily Jane Bronte, by *Romer Wilson*	4.00	2.00
The Story of Law, by *John M. Zane*	5.00	2.50

THE NEW REPUBLIC BOOKSTORE
419 West 21st Street, N. Y. C.

For the enclosed.....please send me post-paid .....

.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

4-23-30